44822

National Library of Canada
Canadian Theses Division
Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Division des thèses canadiennes

PERMISSION TO MICROFILM — AUTORISATION DE MICROFILMER

• Please print or type — Écrire en lettres moulées ou dactylographier

Full Name of Author — Nom complet de l'auteur

Robert Spenceley

Date of Birth — Date de naissance

April 24 1980

Country of Birth — Lieu de naissance

Canada

Permanent Address — Résidence fixe

169 Dunvegan Road
Toronto Ontario
M5P 2P1

Title of Thesis — Titre de la thèse

Lenin and Kautsky on the Dictatorship of the Proletariat

University — Université

University of Alberta

Degree for which thesis was presented — Grade pour lequel cette thèse fut présentée

M.A.

Year this degree conferred — Année d'obtention de ce grade

1980

Name of Supervisor — Nom du directeur de thèse

Don Carmichael

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

Date

April 24, 1980

Signature

R Spenceley

NL-91 (4/77)

National Library of Canada
Collections Development Branch

Canadian Theses on
Microfiche Service

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction du développement des collections

Service des thèses canadiennes
sur microfiche

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NL-339 (Rev. 8/80)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

Lenin and Kautsky on the Dictatorship of the Proletariat

by

© Robert H.W. Spenceley

A Thesis
Submitted to the faculty of graduate studies and research in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of master of arts.

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

Edmonton, Alberta
Spring, 1980

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Lenin and Kautsky on the Dictatorship of the Proletariat"

submitted by Robert Spenceley

in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

.....
Supervisor

.....

.....

Date March 27, 1980

ABSTRACT

With the breakdown of the Second International, that followed the outbreak of the First World War, it became clear that Kautsky and Lenin held radically differing conceptions of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This divergence has, in fact, remained a nodal point in the antagonism between Leninist and social-democratic political tendencies.

I hope to indicate that Kautsky's conception of socialism - and the political strategy he theorized as the means of reaching it - was based on an economistic vision of historical development. Beyond this, I hope to indicate that Kautsky's economism led him to ignore a number of crucial problems and contradictions which socialism must face.

In the second chapter I will argue that the character of Lenin's Marxism - at the heart of which was the "concrete analysis of the concrete situation" - formed the basis for his break with Kautsky's political strategy and his conception of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Secondly, I will argue that, although Lenin's break with Kautsky was fundamental in many respects, there remained one area within which Lenin's break was incomplete. I hope to indicate that Lenin, like Kautsky, did not recognise that the "technical" division of labour developed by capitalism is inseparable from capitalist production relations.

In the third, concluding chapter I will elaborate what is, in fact, the leitmotiv of the whole analysis. This being that the socio-technical division of labour developed by capitalism is structured by, and serves to reproduce, the dominant position of capital within the production process. It follows from this thesis - which is explicit in Marx's Capital - that a fundamental task of the dictatorship of the proletariat must be the radical transformation of the ideological practices and socio-political relations which are part of the productive apparatus inherited by socialism from capitalism.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	(The Dictatorship of the Proletariat)	p.1
CHAPTER ONE	(The Marxism of Karl Kautsky)	p.9
	Kautsky's Conception of Capitalist Development	p.13
	Socialist Revolution and the Productive Apparatus	p.20
	Kautsky on the Dictatorship of the Proletariat	p.26
	Kautsky's Economism	p.33
	Non-Proletarian Classes and Socialism	p.36
	Production Relations and the Building of Socialism	p.39
	Conclusions	p.42
CHAPTER TWO	(Lenin and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat)	p.48
	The Principal Task of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat	p.49
	A State of a New Type	p.56
	A Dictatorship of a New Type	p.59
	Collectivization	p.67
	Lenin and Socialist Revolution in the Sphere of Production	p.70
	Taylorism	p.75
	Conclusions	p.80
CHAPTER THREE	(Social Production Relations and Historical Transition)	p.88

CHAPTER THREE (cont'd)

The Problem	p.88
Social Relations of Production	p.96
The Transition from Feudalism	p.102
Manufacture	p.104
Machinery	p.105
A Fundamental Feature of Historical Transition	p.109
Conclusions	p.111

BIBLIOGRAPHY p.117

INTRODUCTION

The Dictatorship of the Proletariat

The recent emergence of Eurocommunism has given rise to a widespread debate on the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Unfortunately, this debate is often conducted in an abstract manner.[1] The debate is abstract in that the question of the form of the socialist state is often separated from the socio-political tasks which this state must accomplish. In fact, the separation of the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat from its most fundamental task, the transformation of social relations at the level of production, has facilitated the repudiation of the dictatorship of the proletariat by the major communist parties of Western Europe. It is often asserted that a "dictatorial" socialist state may have been necessary in a particular historical conjuncture, but that this is no longer the case.[2] I hope to indicate, to the contrary, that the essential characteristic of the socialist state - which makes it the "dictatorship of the proletariat" - is determined by tasks and contradictions which every socialist regime must face.

It is well known that the break between Lenin and Kautsky - which signified the splitting of the European labour movement into social-democratic and communist tendencies - took place precisely over the question of the "dictatorship of the pro-

letariat". In this paper I will examine the conceptions of the dictatorship of the proletariat held respectively by Kautsky and Lenin. Kautsky and Lenin were concerned with problems of socialism which continue to occupy Marxists today. At the centre of these questions is the problem of the relation between proletarian dictatorship and democracy. In a rare, scholarly analysis of Kautsky, Massimo Salvadori has suggested that the "approach of Western Communist Parties to these problems today has assumed a shape which ... can be defined, without the slightest provocation, as essentially 'Kautskyist'".[3] I cannot assess the validity of this judgement here. However, I do believe that figures such as Santiago Carrillo and Georges Marchais have adopted a number of theoretical and strategic positions which were characteristic of Kautsky's opposition to Lenin's conception of the dictatorship of the proletariat. These positions are:

1) Socialism is the result of the evolution of democracy under capitalism. Socialism, as Georges Marchais has argued, "will be a higher stage of democracy and freedom, it will be democracy pushed to its farthest limits."[4] Which is to say, there will be no qualitative break in the form taken by capitalist and proletarian democracy.

2) Socialism represents the interests and power of the great majority of people, therefore, there will be no need for a dictatorhsip under socialism. This position is premised on a belief in the likelihood of a revolutionary party attaining the electoral support of a large

majority of the population.

3) Dictatorship is the "negation of democracy". Democracy is said to represent the power of the majority, while a dictatorship of the majority is held to be impossible.

4) The class nature of the state as such is not recognised, rather, it is asserted that democracy by its nature must be democracy for all.

5) In Lenin's conception of socialism, the dictatorship of the proletariat would be, at the very best, the dictatorship of the working class over the rest of the population.

By examining the relation between Kautsky's conception of the evolution of capitalism, his political strategy, and his view of socialism, I hope to indicate the nature and origin of these theses in Kautsky's thought.

In my analysis of Lenin I will examine some of the ways in which he broke with the abstract and economistic character of Kautsky's Marxism. I will indicate why, in Lenin's conception of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the "democratic" and dictatorial (read: revolutionary) tasks of socialism are inseparable. In fact, I will argue that for Lenin, the dictatorial tasks of socialism, e.g., the destruction of the state, social relations, and ideology inherited from capitalism, determine the basic form of democracy under socialism. I will also indicate the basis of Lenin's opposition to the argument

that socialism could be introduced by means of an electoral majority.

Finally, although Lenin argued that it was unlikely that socialism could be introduced by means of an electoral majority, I hope to show that he did not have a "workerist" conception of socialism. That is to say, he did not, as Kautsky charged, conceive of socialism as the dictatorship of the working class over the rest of the population.[5] The dictatorship of the proletariat, wrote Lenin,

> ... is a specific form of class alliance between the proletariat, the vanguard of the working class, and the numerous non-proletarian strata of working people (petty-bourgeoisie, small proprietors, the peasantry, the intelligensia, etc.) or the majority of these strata, ..., an alliance whose aim is the complete overthrow of capital... [6]

Thus far I have indicated some of the ways in which Lenin broke with Kautsky. In these and other ways Lenin laid the basis for a radical critique of Kautsky's conception of socialism. Nevertheless, I will argue that there is an economist/technicalist tendency which is common to both Kautsky's and Lenin's conceptions of the tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat within the sphere of production.

A decisive weakness in both Kautsky's and Lenin's analyses of socialism stems from their failure to recognise that the productive technology and the socio-technical division of labour developed under capitalism are intrinsically condition-

ed by the class relations within which they develop. In their analyses of socialism neither Kautsky nor Lenin took into account that the productive technology and socio-technical division of labour developed under capitalism function to reproduce the subordination of labour to capital. As Marx explained in Capital (III),

> ... if the capitalist mode of production presupposes this definite social form of the conditions of production, so does it reproduce it continually. It produces not merely the material products, but reproduces continually the production relations in which the former are produced and also the corresponding distribution relations.(emphasis added)7

The capitalist production process itself constitutes the matrix of the reproduction of class relations in the capitalist mode of production. It follows from this that the socio-technical division of labour is at the very heart of the process of class division and conflict. One implication of the fact that within capitalism exploitation takes place within the production process is that social classes are defined, most fundamentally, by the positions occupied by agents of production within the production process. Relations of distribution and legal ownership generally, but not necessarily, correspond to the structure of social relations within the sphere of production. Marx stressed this in his 1857 Introduction a Critique of Political Economy:

> The structure of distribution is completely determined by the structure of production. Distribution is itself a product of production ... in that the specific kind of parti-

cipation in production determines the specific forms of distribution, i.e., the pattern of participation of distribution. (emphasis added)[8]

Within the process of social reproduction, within the unity constituted by the processes of production, distribution, exchange and consumption, it is production which predominates. I cannot explore the conditions which resulted in Kautsky's and Lenin's blindness to the role played by the socio-technical division of labour - by the structure of the production process - in the reproduction of capital. I do hope to indicate that recognition of this aspect of the capitalist mode of production has decisive implications for an analysis of socialism. Most importantly, it means that the conditions for the reproduction of capital will not be completely eliminated by the establishment of a proletarian state and its nationalisation of the means of production, equalisation of incomes, etc. Capital will not be irreversibly defeated until its material basis in the "structure of production" has been eliminated. This indicates a fundamental task of socialism which neither Kautsky nor Lenin recognised; viz., the transformation of the productive apparatus inherited from capitalism.

I will conclude the analysis by examining the relation between the productive technology and socio-technical division of labour of capitalism and capital. I will argue that the establishment of capitalist production relations pre-dated the emergence of a specifically capitalist division of labour - which is characterized by the domination of living labour by

dead labour and the division between intellectual and manual labour. I hope to indicate that the socio-technical division of labour of capitalism developed in accordance with the socio-political imperatives of capital. Finally, I will argue that the socio-technical division of labour functions to reproduce the subsumption of labour under capital. I am concerned to elaborate these theses because they have implications for an analysis of the dictatorship of the proletariat that neither Lenin nor Kautsky, nor the majority of their followers, has fully appreciated.

Footnotes

Introduction

1) See, for example, Santiago Carrillo, Eurocommunism and the State (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1977).

2) Ibid., pp. 151 ff.

3) Massimo Salvadori, Karl Kautsky and the Socialist Revolution (London: N.L.B., 1979), p.13.

4) Georges Marchais, as quoted in, "Proletarian Dictatorship and Democracy", Proletarian Unity (Montreal, December, 1978), No. 14, pp.14-27.

5) Karl Kautsky, The Dictatorship of the Proletariat (Manchester: The National Labour Press, 1919), pp.20-30.

6) V.I. Lenin, "'Forward to' Deception of the People with Slogans", Collected Works, (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1961), p.381.

7) Karl Marx, Capital (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1964), Volume III, pp.445-6.

8) Karl Marx, Grundrisse (London: Allen Lane, 1973), p.95.

CHAPTER I

The Marxism of Karl Kautsky

By the year 1890 the German Social-Democratic Party (S.P.D.) had become the largest and most influential socialist party in the world. The S.P.D. found imitators throughout Europe, and beyond. In fact, as G.D.H. Cole states, the S.P.D. "appeared to be setting the line of European Socialism almost everywhere, if not for the world."[1] The prestige of the S.P.D. may, in part, be attributed to Marx's and (especially) Engels' association with it. However, there can be no doubt that the party's endurance of thirteen years of repression under Bismarck and its emergence in 1890 to win nearly twenty per cent of the popular vote was the decisive factor in this regard. It was also the very success of the S.P.D. which threw it into crisis.

The leaders of the S.P.D. were optimistic that the political and numerical strength of the party would continue to grow. The S.P.D. however, was not the only political force within the German working class. Trade unions and a new co-operative movement had sprung up among the industrial workers. Both these movements were interested in attaining a series of immediate reforms (e.g. legal recognition) which would allow their further growth. This put a strong pressure on the S.P.D. If it was to extend its electoral base within the working class

it had to adopt a contructive attitude toward parliamentary reforms.[2] Similarly, it was clear to everyone (in spite of all theories to the contrary) that the middle classes, as yet, remained a very significant part of the population. In light of this fact, the S.P.D. had to appeal to non-proletarian classes, particularly the peasantry. This could be done only by offering them something they wanted - immediate, piecemeal reforms. In short, these and other political considerations,[3] plus the advent of a relatively progressive Emperor and the growth of a large party and trade union bureaucracy (which almost inevitably exerts a conservative influence) compelled the S.P.D. to reconsider its nature as a revolutionary party - something which was never in doubt under conditions of illegality.

It was at this time of crisis that Karl Kautsky arose as the chief theorist of the S.P.D., and as the champion of revolutionary Marxism. Against a strong current within the party, Kautsky asserted that the State was an intrument of class domination; he concluded that it was the duty of socialists to weaken, rather than extend, the influence of the State. Kautsky argued the capitalist state never allowed social reforms to go beyond what was demanded by the interests of the dominant classes.[4] It followed from this that capitalism could not "slide" into socialism, that decisive reforms would have to wait until the proletariat held political power.

Kautsky argued against the making of concessions to the middle classes in order to attract their electoral support.

Confident that historical development would favour the proletariat, Kautsky fought against any tendency to weaken the party's independence by trying to appeal to non-working class voters. To give one example, Kautsky argued that since "American-style" capitalist agriculture was destined to replace small (retrogressive), peasant agriculture, it would be counter-productive to prolong its existence.[5] Kautsky argued that as petty bourgeois elements were faced with proletarianization, and as the political strength of the working class grew, these non-proletarian classes would naturally rally around the Socialist party. There was therefore no need to endanger the coherence and integrity of Social-Democracy by appealing to peasant concerns.

Similarly, Kautsky fought against arguments that the S.P.D, should form alliances with progressive bourgeois parties. He argued that a "coalition" government would be inherently incapable of carrying out major attacks on the power and interests of the ruling classes. Moreover, it would be unable to prevent the repression of the workers. This, would serve only to "compromise a proletarian party and confuse and split the working class. Therefore, it is only through purely proletarian political domination (that) ... the working class can exercise its political power."[6]

In regard to these and other debates, Kautsky's arguments were of real political importance. Kautsky's political influence found voice in the party's Erfurt Programme (1891), of which he was the main architect. As the "pope of orthodoxy", Kautsky not only repelled the threat of Bernstein's revisionism. He also played a major role in actually defining what was considered to be orthodox revolutionary Marxism.

Nevertheless, I will argue that Kautsky's Marxism was economistic. The importance of the undialectical or economistic character of Kautsky's conception of the development of capitalism is that his political strategy and his conception of socialism are inseparable from his analysis of capitalist development. This reflects the fact that Kautsky believed that capitalism would inevitably produce circumstances within which the bulk of the population would join the cause of socialism - out of an almost instinctive sense of survival.[7] It reflects, secondly, Kautsky's belief that capitalism created the economic and political apparatus upon which the building of socialism could progress. I hope to indicate that Kautsky's conception of the development of capitalism led him to advocate a political strategy which was not effectively different from the "empirical reformism" against which he fought. I also hope to indicate that Kautsky's theory of the "evolution" of capitalism blinded him to a number of problems and contradictions which socialism cannot avoid.

Kautsky's Conception of Capitalist Development

Within the Second International, there was a widely held belief that capitalism was approaching its final collapse. Kautsky's theory of economic devlopment was animated by this belief. Statements such as the following can be found throughout his pre-war writings:

> We consider the breakdown of existing society as inevitable, since we know that economic development creates with a natural necessity conditions which force the exploited to strive against private property; that it increases the number and power of the exploited while it reduces the number and power of the exploiters...; that it leads, finally, to unbearable conditions for the mass of the population, which leave it only a choice between passive degeneration and the active overthrow of the existing system of ownership.8

Kautsky's often repeated warning of the possibility of the "passive degeneration" of the proletariat, and a consequent relapse of society into "barbarism", was presented more as a condemnation of capitalism than as a real historical possibility. For Kautsky believed that capitalism created, with a "natural necessity", the conditions which would lead to the triumph of socialism. Most important in this regard was his belief that capitalism was effecting a rapid "proletarianization" of the bulk of the population. Kautsky argued that the development of large scale capitalist production and commerce resulted in the ever widening proletarianization of the various sectors of the traditional petty bourgeoisie, i.e., the peasants, craftsmen, and shopkeepers. Secondly, Kautsky

asserted that the "decline of the mass of educated people", e.g., white collar workers, professionals, management personnel, "into the class of the proletariat can no longer be checked".[9] This tendency marked the emergence of, what Kautsky termed, an "educated proletariat".

Kautsky did not assert that this new sector of the proletariat would immediately join the revolutionary struggle. He noted that the "bulk of these proletarians" still displayed an element of false consciousness, viz., they "still imagine that they are something better than proletarians"[10] Kautsky based his classification of this diverse social group on their character as wage earners - and the insecurity that this involved. Failing to analyse the relations of this group to other sections of the working class, he failed to recognise that the "pretensions" of this group might have a lasting material basis which would oppose it to the "battling proletariat". It is clear from Kautsky's text that he believed that "objective circumstances", its status as wage earners, would eventually lead this strata to the cause of socialism.

Kautsky saw the increasing "proletarianization" of the population as inevitably resulting in an ever-worsening series of crises of overproduction and destructive consumption. These crises, "with the certainty of natural law" would result from underconsumption on the part of the masses, for the "moment the wage-workers constitute the bulk of the consumers, the

products in which the surplus lies locked up become unsalable".[11] Kautsky saw capitalism as a historically progressive force, but one which had outlived its time. He saw the contradiction between the increasingly centralized and socialized character of the productive forces and the private property system as denying society the benefits of the application of science to the production process. This contradiction, and the resulting series of crises, would bring the bulk of the population to socialism - out of a sheer instinct for survival. In 1886 Kautsky wrote:

> It is true that all progress within the capitalist mode of production bears within it the seeds of new prosperity and greater well-being. It does not, however produce these automatically, but rather through such terrible contradictions that to overcome and resolve them becomes an inevitable necessity.12

Kautsky was confident that the historical bankruptcy of capitalism, the contradiction between its increasing productive potential and the "painful convulsions" to which it subjected society, would lead to the eventual triumph of the proletariat. This confidence that the course of history favoured the proletariat was reinforced by the electoral gains of the S.P.D. In this respect Kautsky's optimism was shared by other leading figures of German Social-Democracy. This optimism was typified by Engels who suggested that capitalism would reach its final decline "by the end of the century"; while, on the other hand, the rise of Social-Democracy would proceed "as spontaneously, as steadily, as irresistably and

at the same time as tranquilly as a natural process."[13] Similarly, Kautsky argued that the "continual electoral victories of the Socialists" will give the proletariat "such a feeling of confidence", and so "overawe" the bourgeoisie, that it will be "impossible to prevent the seizure of power of the state and the transformation of the relations of powers in government".[14]

This fundamental confidence, with its economistic basis, was the source of Kautsky's contradictory political position. On the one hand, Kautsky fought against empiricism in theory and "revisionism" in practice. This struggle earned him the title of "the pope of orthodoxy". On the other hand, his confidence that the course of history favoured the cause of socialism led him to oppose any "premature" attempt at revolution; a "premature" attempt at revolution being effectively defined as one which could not be prosecuted by parliamentary means.

Kautsky was a strident opponent of "Ministeralism" - the participation of socialists in bourgeois governments. He argued that real social change could not be effected by means of alliances with bourgeois parties. Kautsky asserted that the conquest of power must be the work of the proletariat as a united class. This could only occur when it was strong enough to "undertake a victorious struggle against the entire bourgeois world".[15]

Similarly, Kautsky fought against the growing influence of trade union bureaucrats who urged the party to adopt the "realistic" course of straightforward reformism. In contrast to figures such as Bernstein, Kautsky held that the parliamentary struggle and piecemeal reformism could not be used to transform society. Their essential purpose, to which Kautsky attached great importance, was to increase the confidence and organizational strength of the proletariat.[16]

Kautsky attacked any tendency that he perceived as threatening the political and ideological independence of Social-Democracy. Kautsky stressed the importance of protecting the party from empiricism. In this regard he attached much importance to revolutionary bourgeois intellectuals.[17] Kautsky's influence on Lenin in this respect can be seen in What Is To Be Done?.[18]

Ironically, however, while Kautsky fought against the threats of empiricism and reformism his confidence that the development of capitalism must result in a crisis, within which the overthrow of capitalism would attain the support of the bulk of the population, led him to advocate a political strategy essentially the same as that of explicitly reformist figures. In The Road to Power Kautsky stated that "everything should be avoided that would tend to provoke the ruling class to a purposeless policy of violence" - for this would only serve to set back the electoral progress of the Socialists.[19] In this connection, Kautsky stated that the Paris Commune

was "the last great defeat of the proletariat" and that the "steady progress the proletariat had made since was the result of the adoption of "peaceful methods".[20] Kautsky showed no appreciation of the possibility that parliamentary struggle might serve to integrate the labour movement into the structure of capitalism. Always fearful of bourgeois reaction, Kautsky could never establish a strategy effectively distinct from that of his opponents. Kautsky himself recognised his de facto, practical, unity with figures he had described as bougeois reformists:

> I then found myself closely linked to Bernstein. We came together again during the war. Each of us preserved his own political physiognomy, but in practical action we found ourselves almost always in agreement. So has it continued to the present day.21

It may be noted that in asserting that the proletariat could no longer make use of tactics characteristic of the Paris Commune in committing itself to peaceful struggle, Kautsky did not explicitly suggest that the proletariat limit itself to strictly legal means of struggle. However, having made an electoral majority the object of the party's political strategy, Kautsky was extremely cautious in advocating tactics, such as the mass strike, which might alienate potential electoral support or provoke a reactionary policy on the part of the authoritarian German state. Nevertheless, in Kautsky's view, the adoption of a solidly parliamentary strategy was not an abondonment of the cause of revolution, it was

the most certain and least costly, albeit not the quickest, means toward revolution:

> ....if it cannot prevent Revolution, it (parliamentary politics) can avoid many reckless and premature attempts at revolution, and render many revolutionary movements unnecessary. ... The direction of evolution is not thereby altered, but the pace is made more steady and even. The coming to the front of the proletariat in a State with some measure of democratic government will not be marked by such a striking victory as attended the middle classes in their revolutionary period, nor will it be exposed to violent overthrow.22 (emphasis added)

This passage sums up well Kautsky's view of the road toward socialism. Confident that the proportional size of the proletariat would continue to increase and that the masses generally would be subjected to an ever worsening series of crises, Kautsky was sure that, when conditions were "ripe", the proletarian party would gain control of the government by peaceful means. For this reason Kautsky rejected as "adventuristic" any attempt at a "premature" revolution; a "premature" attempt being defined precisely as one which required the use of violent or dictatorial means. The passage also indicates that Kautsky believed that a socialist government which attained power by electoral means would not be "exposed to violent overthrow". Kautsky also believed that a socialist government could proceed in the building of socialism without any use of "dictatorial" means. In The Renegade Kautsky Lenin asserted that both these positions were utterly naive.[23] Historical experience seems to have supported Lenin. However, Kautsky's commitment to a "democratic"

i.e., parliamentary, attainment of power was not simply the result of a lack of political realism. It corresponded to his conception of the course that the development of capitalism would inevitably take. It also corresponded to what he conceived of as the tasks of the proletariat in the building of socialism.

Socialist Revolution and the Productive Apparatus

Kautsky believed that the contradiction between the increasingly centralized and socialized character of the productive forces of capitalism and the structure of market and private property relations was propelling society toward an increasingly severe series of crises of under consumption. This belief, which was commonplace throughout the Second International, seems to have been more a matter of faith than of critical analysis. As Colletti noted, it was precisely this dogmatic faith which opened the "orthodox" theorists to Bernstein's empirical refutations.[24] Nevertheless, Kautsky stated:

> The productive forces that have been generated in capitalist society have become irreconcilable with the very system of property upon which it is built. The endeavor to uphold the system of property ... condemns society to stagnation and decay...

Kautsky goes on to ask:

> Shall the system of private ownership in the means of production be allowed to pull society with itself down into the abyss; or shall society shake off that burden and then, free and strong, resume the path of

> progress which the evolutionary law prescribes to it? (emphasis added) 25

As I have suggested, Kautsky did not expect society to fall into the abyss. He believed that in a final "convulsion" the bulk of the population would abandon capitalism. For Kautsky, the building of socialism would be, in essence, the creation of a new societal structure which, by means of state planning, could make the fullest and most rational use of the powerful productive apparatus generated by capitalism. Kautsky did not recognise any need to transform the structure of the productive apparatus inherited from capitalism. For Kautsky, the development of the productive forces of capitalism was not - beyond being accelerated or fettered at different stages of history - essentially affected by the structure of capitalist class relation. The task of socialism vis-a-vis the productive apparatus inherited from capitalism was not to transform it, but to facilitate its fullest development.

In The Class Struggle, Kautsky stresses that socialism will not interrupt "economic development". Socialism does not "imply that it is necessary to revive the dead past or to restore old forms of community property or communal production". On the contrary, Kautsky assures his readers that:

> ... socialism will not put an end to economic development. On the contrary, it is the only means to ensure its progress beyond a certain point. In socialist society as in society today... large industry will develop more and more and increasingly absorb small industry...

> The direction of the evolution remains the same, but socialism removes all the painful and shocking manifestations that under the present system are the accompaniments of the social evolution.26 (emphasis added)

After the property of the bourgeoisie has been expropriated, something which Kautsky forsees as being "the simplest incident among the great transformations of the social revolution", Kautsky asserts that one of "the imperative tasks of the social revolution" will be "not simply to continue but to increase production". Toward this end, Kautsky asserts that the socialist regime must study the methods of the American trusts, "from which very much can be learned concerning the methods of the social revolution."[27] Kautsky goes on to discuss these methods in detail, (e.g. night work, split-shifts, and, above-all, the concentration of production into "the most perfect industrial plants") and concludes that: "Socialist production must make use of these same methods in still higher degree."[28] In short, socialism, by such means as centralized state planning, will make better use of the productive apparatus created by capitalism than was possible under capitalism.

Kautsky notes that production cannot be increased without the active involvement of the workers. How is this to be attained once the workers have been freed from the threat of hunger and unemployment? Kautsky immediately states the enforcement of "barrack-like" discipline would be unacceptable - and unnecessary. Kautsky argues that "once labour loses the repulsive

character of overwork and when the hours of labour are reduced to a reasonable degree" most workers will continue to work out of simple force of habit.[29]

Beyond this, Kautsky states that it will be necessary to make labour, "which today is a burden, a joy, so that it will be a pleasure to work, so that the labourer will go to his work with pleasure."[30] However, although he asserts the necessity of transforming the character of work, Kautsky does not present this as a problem of breaking down the division of labour developed by capitalism. On the contrary, the means which Kautsky mentions by which the socialist regime will transform the character of work (e.g. shortening hours of work, making places of work safer, more hygenic, and more pleasant) are, as Kautsky quite frankly states, "simply a continuation of efforts that today are somewhat developed in all labour legislation."[31] Kautsky, in a book which deals particularly with the objectives and likely problems of a socialist regime, makes scant mention of the abolition of the division of labour. When he does it is presented as the ultimate outcome of the economic evolution of socialism, rather than the object of the <u>political practice</u> of the proletariat. That is to say, Kautsky sees the abolition of the division of labour as coming about by the development of the productive apparatus to such a degree that it frees "the mass of the population from its present material fetters;" viz., the need to work.[32]

Let us examine this point at greater length. According to Kautsky, socialism would not only inherit capitalism's tendency toward the centralization of the means of production, it would also inherit the organization of labour and productive technology developed by capitalism. Kautsky states categorically that "freedom of labour has come to an end." "In each place", Kautsky continues, "the activities of every individual worker are defined and regulated. This has become a technical necessity."[33] (emphasis added) Socialism will not, and cannot, "check this development" which, according to Kautsky, "is but the natural tendency of the economic development of modern society."[34]

Even in socialist society the worker will remain unable to determine the time, duration, conditions, or object of his labour; if anything, he will exercise even less freedom under socialism than under capitalism. At any rate, according to Kautsky, he must remain but "one of the wheels" of the production process.[35] Kautsky argues, nevertheless, that in a socialist community the "lack of freedom in work" will not only lose its oppressive character, it would "also become the foundation of the highest freedom yet possible to man."[36] Labour will lose its oppressive character, in part, as a result of the transformation of a capitalist factory into a "democratic factory".

That is to say, Kautsky envisages that the workers will elect their managers, foremen, supervisors, etc. Thus, iron discipline will still be necessary but it will be "a democratic submission, a free will submission to a self-chosen leader."[37] The capitalists could, says Kautsky, "continue to be the directors of the factories, but they could cease to be masters and exploiters."[38] However, the key to Kautsky's thought on this matter is that for him "freedom" and labour are irreversibly antithetical. Kautsky argues that:

> It is not freedom of labour, but <u>freedom from</u> labour, which in a socialist society the use of machinery makes increasingly possible, that will bring mankind freedom of life, freedom of intellectual and artistic activity.39 (emphasis is Karl Kautsky's)

Kautsky saw labour as a necessary evil, as a denial of life and intellect, which socialism must reduce as much as possible. Kautsky saw freedom from the need to work as the basis of full human liberation. Kautsky did not expect that this increasing amount of leisure time would be used in the manner in which it is under capitalism. It would, rather, be a society in which: "What slaves were to the ancient Athenians, machinery will be to modern man."[40] That is to say, it will be a society in which all the members of the community will possess the time and ability to seek the moral, artistic and intellectual development of society - as an end in itself. This however, is a description of the future communist society, a stage of development which can be reached only through the

long and complete development of the productive apparatus inherited from capitalism.

Since Kautsky's view of the democratic state of socialism is inseparable from his conception of the tasks of the socialist revolution in the sphere of production, and since both are based on common theoretical weaknesses, I will proceed to discuss Kautsky's view of the State before presenting any critical remarks.

Kautsky on The Dictatorship of the Proletariat

In The Class Struggle Kautsky's examination of the State is highly unsystematic, yet he does present some interesting arguments. Kautsky states that the "modern state grew with and through the capitalist class, just as in turn it has become the most powerful support of that class, ..."[41] Kautsky notes that with the increasing sensitivity and complexity of the economy, the state is increasingly compelled "to step in and take a hand in the regulation and management of the economic mechanism."[42] Moreover, Kautsky states that with the increasing intensity of class antagonisms the bourgeoisie requires the state to organize itself and to protect itself from other classes.

In short, Kautsky argues that the growth of the state is not hostile to the capitalist system; but, rather, it is a function of its development. The nationalisation of certain

industries, for instances, does not constitute an attack on the bourgeoisie. Kautsky concludes that the "state will not cease to be a capitalist institution until the proletariat, the working class, has become the ruling class."[43]

However, although Kautsky recognised the class nature of the capitalist state, he did not recognise the class nature of the state as such. That is to say, Kautsky's characterization of the state as capitalist rested on a simply empirical analysis; i.e., its overt domination by the bourgeoisie and its allies. Kautsky believed the state apparatus inherited from capitalism could be used to introduce socialism, once the proletariat has attained control of it. Kautsky stated essentially this in The Social Revolution:

> ...the governmental power was never so strong as now, nor the military, bureaucratic and economic forces so powerfully developed. It follows from this that the proletariat, when it shall have conquered governmental powers, will have thereby obtained the power to at once bring about the most extensive social change.[44]

Kautsky did not recognise that the structure of the state, the apparatus through which the state power of the ruling class is materialised, is not characterized by historical autonomy. The form of the state is determined by the structure of class conflict at the level of production. To give an example, the wage relation between capital and labour presumes a form of the state within which individuals are "free"

to sell or buy labour-power. Within feudalism the extraction of surplus-labour did not, as under capitalism, occur within the productive process. The surplus was extracted by the "extra economic" means of the ruling class. It thus presumed a form of the state characterized by the direct exercise of political power by the ruling class. Which is to say, it precluded any notion of the "equality of men". In this connection we may note Marx's argument in Capital that:

> The specific economic form, in which unpaid surplus-labour is pumped out of the direct producers, determines the relationship of rulers to ruled, as it grows directly out of production itself... Upon this... is founded the entire formation of the economic community which grows up out of the production relations themselves, thereby simultaneously its own political form.45

Having failed to see any intrinsic relation between the form of the state and the class structure of society, Kautsky limited the tasks of socialism vis-a-vis the state apparatus to one of democratization; i.e., to its "perfection" rather than its "abolition". In The Social Revolution Kautsky lists the political changes that the proletariat would undertake. In "the first place" the proletariat would realise the democratic programme for which the bourgeoisie once stood. That is to say, it would "extend universal suffrage to every individual and establish complete freedom of press and assemblage". Beyond this, the proletariat would make the state completely independent of the church, it would abolish all rights of inheritance, wipe away the remnants of feudalism, reform the

educational system, and undertake "fundamental reforms in taxation."[46]

Kautsky recognizes that all "these are means that bourgeois radicalism has placed before itself." The socialist regime, however, will have the power and "a disregard of capital of which no bourgeois class is capable", which are necessary for the attainment of these objectives.[47] Moreover, Kautsky argues that the socialist state will go beyond bourgeois-democratic reforms in that it will decrease unemployment as much as possible while, at the same time eradicating the worst aspects of unemployment (e.g. poverty).

Kautsky believed that the proletariat was not to "smash" the State; but rather, it was to gain "mastery over the machinery of government to introduce the socialist system of production."[48] In this respect, Kautsky thought the abolition of unemployment would be of critical importance. For, if the labourer "can once be secure of existence even when he is not working, nothing would be easier than for him to overthrow capital". "Once things have gone this far the employer would be beaten in every conflict with his employees and be quickly compelled to give in to them."[49]

In short, Kautsky believed that the bourgeoisie would not dare violently to assault a government elected by means of parliamentary politics. Capitalists, faced with a hostile

socialist regime would quickly realize that the "political domination of the proletariat and the continuation of the capitalist system of produciton are irreconcilable." In fact, argues Kautsky:

> once the capitalists recognized ... that they had the right to bear only the risk and burdens of capitalist business, these men would be the very first ones to renounce the further extension of capitalist production and to demand that their undertakings be purchased because they could no longer carry them on with any advantage.[50]

Kautsky, then, forsees not a continuation of the class struggle under socialism, but rather, its rapid decline. One reason why Kautsky did not foresee the continuation, (much the less, the intensification) of the class struggle was that he did not see one of the primary political tasks of the proletariat to be the radical transformation of social relations of production. That is to say, he failed to acknowledge Engel's advice that society cannot simply take possession of all the means of production "without revolutionizing from top to bottom the old method of production and first putting an end to the old division of labour."[51] Not seeing this transformation as a political task of socialism, Kautsky could not theorize the political structure necessary to accomplish it.

Kautsky underestimated the seriousness of the contradictions which any revolutionary regime inevitably faces. In this

regard, Lenin berated Kautsky for ignoring the fact that an overthrown bourgeoisie could draw aid - even direct military support - from its international connections.[52] Secondly, Lenin argued that even after it was overthrown the bourgeoisie would retain material advantages, e.g., education, property, money, and the confidence that comes from habit and custom. Finally, Lenin noted that in every revolution there is inevitably immense confusion among the masses and, consequently, "a section of the exploited or the least developed section of the middle peasant, artisan and similar masses, may, and indeed do, follow the exploiters".[53] Throughout his career, Kautsky overemphasized the bourgeoisie's commitment to democracy. He believed that if the bourgeoisie was faced with a democratically elected parliamentary majority it would philosophically accept its fate.

Kautsky sees the "political aspect" of the socialist revolution as the triumph of "democracy"; viz., as the establishment of a type of government which already existed in a number of countries. According to Kautsky, the "dictatorship of the proletariat" refers not to a "form of government", but to "a condition of government". For, continues Kautsky, "when we speak of dictatorship as a form of government, we cannot mean the dictatorship of a class. For, ... a class can only rule, not govern."[54] Kautsky did recognise that in capitalism state power is the power of one class - the ruling class. For this reason, Marx referred to even parliamentary democracies as a form of bourgeois dictatorship.[55] The dictatorship of the

proletariat, for Kautsky, signifies the establishment of the proletariat as the ruling class.

The establishment of the proletariat as the ruling class would, of course, mark a great historical revolution. Kautsky, however, believed that the "evolution" of society could progress - even in its most decisive ruptures - in an essentially peaceful, democratic way. Aside from his overestimation of the commitment of both the bourgeoisie and the masses to parliamentary democracy, this conception of socialist revolution resulted from the fact that Kautsky did not posit as an object of the class struggle, under the dictatorship of the proletariat, the transformation of either the productive or state apparatus inherited from capitalism.

Criticisms

Kautsky's Economism

In his speech at Marx's graveside Engels compared the scientific stature of Marx and Darwin: "Just as Darwin discovered the law of development of organic nature, so Marx discovered the law of development of human history."[56] We know of the great impact Darwinism had in the late nineteenth century. But, for Kautsky, Darwin's theory was not only comparable to Marx's; it was applicable to the object of Marx's analysis.

In 1924, recalling his own theoretical development, Kautsky noted how Darwinism had "conquered the ranks of culture" and that his "theory of history was intended to be nothing other than the application of Darwinism to social development". "In the mind of a socialist", continued Kautsky, "Darwinism signifies knowledge of the conditions of social life".[57] The primary lesson to be drawn from the application of Darwinism to the study of society was knowledge of the invincibility and inevitability of socialism. Darwinism, wrote Kautsky, indicates that "the transition from an old to a new conception of the world occurs irresistably"; that "the traditional institutions founded on the needs of the preceeding epoch will fall into ruin, while new institutions will take their place."[58]

To trace out all the nuances of Kautsky's fusion of Darwinism with Marxism is beyond my scope and interest. It seems certain, however, that Darwinism reinforced his confidence in the "natural necessity" of socialism as the inevitable product of the "evolution" of capitalism. For Kautsky, the inevitability of socialism was signified by the intensifying contradiction between the increasingly powerful, centralised, and socialised character of the productive forces and the chaotic irrationality of capitalism. Kautsky believed that, having reached a certain level of development, the growth of the productive forces could no longer progress without causing a series of spiraling crises of overproduction. Finally, this contradiction would result in such "unbearable conditions for the mass

of the people that they will have no choice but to go down into degradation or to overthrow the system of private ownership." (emphasis added)[59]

Kautsky insisted that socialism could not come about without a revolution, and that a revolution cannot come about without the "assistance of man". However, Kautsky saw the development of the proletariat as an expression of the contradiction between the development of the productive apparatus and the "system of private ownership". He also posed parliamentary democracy as an essential product of the evolution of capitalism and posited an indissoluble link between socialist revolution and the attainment of a parliamentary majority. In fact, Kautsky saw the dictatorship of the proletariat as a socialist majority in parliament and its use of the state apparatus to transform society. For these reasons, Kautsky argued that no country could "skip" the stages of "normal development". Just as he held that the violence of the ruling class could not alter the course of evolution, he rejected any "adventuristic" attempts at a "premature" revolution. A revolution could not be successful until society was "ripe" for it.

Kautsky's conception of the evolution of capitalism towards socialism was not essentially altered by his analysis of imperialism. Kautsky reacted vehemently against members of the party who argued that socialists should support the introduction of capitalism into "backward" areas of the globe as a

necessary and historically progressive policy. The idea that every country in the world must go through exactly the same course of development, argued Kautsky, was an ideological use of Marx's theory of history for opportunistic political reasons.[60] Kautsky argued that, after the establishment of socialism in advanced capitalist countries, less developed countries might be spared from having to go through a long period of capitalist development.[61]

However, although Kautsky attacked the "opportunistic" tendency to support colonialism, his analysis of imperialism had no essential effect on his conception of the "evolution" of capitalism. For Kautsky, imperialism did not mark a distinct stage of capitalism; but, rather, it was only a "policy" of certain sections of capital.[62] It did not occur to Kautsky that imperialism might result in a displacement of the centre of revolution from the advanced capitalist countries "toward the east", i.e., toward poor, still largely peasant countries. Kautsky's linear conception of the evolution of capitalism prevented him from considering that revolution might break out in the "weak link" of world imperialism. For Kautsky, the possibility of building socialism in a country which had not passed through the stages of "normal development" was conceivable only after socialism had been consolidated throughout the advanced capitalist countries.

Kautsky's conception of the "evolution" of capitalism not only prevented him from conceiving of imperialism as a distinct stage of capitalism, one with profound consequences for the cause of socialism; it also prevented him from even posing a number of problems which are of decisive importance in the building of socialism. I will conclude by indicating what some of these problems are.

Non-Proletarian Classes and Socialism

In The Class Struggle Kautsky writes that capitalism "is rapidly drifting to the point where the whole population of capitalist nations will be deprived of both property and freedom".[63] It is in this sense that he argued that capitalism "takes the ground from under itself."[64] Kautsky was confident that the "evolution"of capitalism would inevitably create the material conditions under which it would be possible to attain a socialist majority in parliament. The importance that he attached to the attainment of a parliamentary majority is indicated by the following passage:

> Suppose the capitalists and their supporters are an insignificant handful. How could they prevent the transition to Socialism under universal suffrage? ... Universal suffrage would reveal them as an insignificant minority, and consequently they would sooner resign themselves to their fate than if the franchise were so shaped that no one could say with certainty which parts had behind it a majority of the people.[65]

Kautsky's belief in the likelihood of a socialist party attaining a large electoral majority was tied to his belief that capitalism led to the increasing "proletarianization" of the population. Kautsky, however, did not recognise that certain propertyless, wage-earning agents of production occupy the place of capital within the sphere of production and, consequently, enjoy privileges and exercise powers which oppose them to the working class as a whole. Kautsky showed a pronounced tendency to consider every extension of the wage form to be an extension of the working class. In effect, his characterization of the agents of production was based exclusively on their ownership or non-ownership of the means of production. It is this which allowed him to believe that the "captialists and their supporters" were becoming "an insignificant handful". For not recognising that capitalism reproduces a "middle class" which occupies a contradictory position vis-a-vis the working class, Kautsky may be criticized for the same thing for which Marx criticized Ricardo:

> What he forgets to emphasize is the constant increase of the middle classes, who stand in the middle between the workers on one side and the capitalists and landed proprietors on the other side, who are for the most part supported directly by revenue, who rest as a burden on the labouring foundation, and who increase the social security and the power of the upper ten thousand. (emphasis added)66

Kautsky noted that with the development of capitalism the productive functions of the capitalist devolve to their "lieutenants", e.g., foreman, technicians, managers, planners,

etc. However, he did not see that the class determination derived from participation of these agents of production in productive labour and their status as wage workers is subordinate to the ideological-political relations of which these employees are the agents and supports. He did not recognise that the "N.C.O.'s of the production process" occupy, as Poulantzas has suggested, "the place of capital".[67] As a consequence of the dual nature of the capitalist production process, which is simultaneously a process of the production of use-values and a process of exploitation, the "lieutenants" or "N.C.O.'s" of this process fulfill not only a technical-supervisory function. They also function to extract and "collect" surplus labour.[68] Which is to say, they serve to reproduce the subsumption of labour under capital.

In short, Kautsky did not consider that employees of capital that enjoy material advantages and are connected to the direct producers by a structure of authoritarian relations may have interests which oppose them to the political struggle of the direct producers. I believe this is also true of wide sections of the "middle class", e.g., lawyers, insurance agents and advertising agents, salesmen, ..., who, as Marx said, "live off surplus labour and whose interests more or less compete with the directly exploiting class in exploiting them (the workers)".[69] This problem not only throws into question the feasibility of a strategy commited to the attainment of

an electoral majority for a revolutionary party; it also has important implications for the building of socialism.

Production Relations and the Building of Socialism

Kautsky's conception of socialism is premised on his belief that given the support of the bulk of the population the bourgeoisie would peacefully accept its fate. The intensity of the class struggle would then quickly subside. However, the basis of the class struggle is not the subjective attitude of any number of individuals, or even of whole classes. The material basis of the class struggle is the set of antagonistic production relations which characterize the capitalist mode of production. Since these relations are conditioned by the structure of the production process which can be transformed only gradually, it follows that capitalist relations will be reproduced even after the bourgeoisie has lost power.

Since those agents of production which function to reproduce the domination of capital over labour derive power, privilege, and status from the space they occupy within the structure of the production process, they may be expected to oppose the transformation of this structure. In this context it is interesting to note Marx's reply to Bakunin's argument that socialism would be characterized by a "free state" of the "whole people":

> (The proletariat) must use measures of force, hence governmental measures; if it itself still remains a class and the economic conditions on which the class struggle and the existence of classes have not yet disappeared, they must be forcibly removed or transformed, and the process of their transformation must be forcibly accelerated.70

The "economic conditions" on which the class struggle is based are not limited to the private ownership of the means of production. As we shall see, they are also constituted by the domination of living labour by dead labour and the division between intellectual and manual labour. The abolition of these "economic conditions" will not happen automatically as a "side-effect" of the development of the productive forces. Rather, their abolition must be the object of the class struggle under the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The division between mental and manual labour is, of course, inherited by socialism. This division of labour is manifested at the level of production in the form of a division between workers who engage in the direct process of production and a hierarchy of engineers, technicians, and managers who supervise, administer, and structure the production process. The "abolition" of the division of labour under socialism involves the integration of these functions into the direct producers. In this context, the bourgeoisie consists not only, as Kautsky imagined, of ex-landowners and capitalists; but also of the elite of "specialists" who are still neces-

sary to the production process and who may try to maintain their positions of power and privilege by undermining the growth of the workers' collective control of the direct production process, of the direction of investment, of technical developments, etc.

In the ideology which governs the productive apparatus developed by capitalism, the relations through which the power and privelege of non-workers are realised appear as technologically necessary. For this reason, the destruction of capitalist social relations in the sphere of production cannot come about, as Kautsky thought, merely through the rapid development of productive forces under the control of the socialist state. The reproduction of relations of domination does not, in the last analysis, depend on the subjective attitude of the persons occupying positions of privilege and power. The real basis for the reproduction of class domination under socialism is the organization, the objective activity, the set of social practices within which the masses are held. Unless there is a strong effort, in the form of the collective struggle of the masses, to replace these relations with new socialist ones, they will inexorably reproduce themselves. This is the lesson of revolutions in this century. It is also what Marx meant by saying that in the course of building socialism the proletariat "will have to go through long struggles, through a series of historic processes, transforming circumstances and men."[72]

Kautsky's limited perception of the problems and contradictions which a socialist regime must face gave his conception of socialism an abstract character. However, Kautsky's conception of socialism corresponds to his conception of historical progress under capitalism. Kautsky believed that capitalism would inevitably produce a situation within which the immediate material interests of the vast bulk of the population would commit them to the building of socialism. Secondly, he did not recognise that the technology and socio-technical division of labour developed by capitalism were integrally linked to the class relations of capitalism. Consequently, he did not recognise the transformation of the productive apparatus inherited from capitalism to be a task of the dictatorship of the proletariat. On the contrary, Kautsky saw the full and rapid development, under "the direction of a well-organised administration", of the productive forces to be the primary task of the dictatorship of the proletariat within the sphere of production.

Failing to recognise that the conditions for the existence of the class struggle would continue to exist under socialism, Kautsky could not accept any argument for the necessity of a proletarian dictatorship. Kautsky could not conceive of the dictatorship of the proletariat as other than a parliamentary democracy within which the proletarian party holds state power.

He viewed parliamentary democracy as the ultra non plus of political institutions. Socialism would limit itself to "perfecting" this institution.

Here Kautsky is explicitly in conflict with Marx and Engels. According to the latter, "one thing especially was proved by the Commune; viz., that the working class cannot lay hold of the ready made State machinery, and wield it for its own purposes."[73] Since it was precisely over this question that Lenin broke with Kautsky, further discussion of it may be best undertaken in that context.

Footnotes

Chapter I

1) G.D.H. Cole, The History of Socialist Thought, Volume III, Part I, (New York: MacMillan, 1965), p.257.

2) Ibid., p.251.

3) Ibid., pp. 251-252.

4) Ibid.. p.268.

5) Ibid., p.264.

6) Karl Kautsky, The Road to Power, (Chicago: Progressive Worker Publishing Co., 1919), p.25.

7) Karl Marx, "1859 Introduction to a Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy", Ed. R.C. Tucker, The Marx - Engels Reader, (New York: W.W. Norton, 1973), p.4.

8) Lucio Colletti, From Rousseau to Lenin, (London: N.L.B., 1973), p.55.

9) Karl Kautsky, The Class Struggle, (New York: W.W. Norton, 1971), p.35.

10) Ibid., p.40.

11) Ibid., pp.68-72.

12) Massimo Salvadori, Karl Kautsky and the Socialist Revolution 1893-1938, (London: N.L.B., 1979), p.23.

13) Quoted by Lucio Colletti, p.60.

14) Kautsky, The Road to Power, p.47.

15) Salvadori, p.72.

16) Ibid., p.44.

17) Ibid., p.46.

18) V.I. Lenin, What Is To Be Done?, (Peking: Foreign Language Press, 1973), p.47.

19) Kautsky, The Road to Power, p.56.

Footnotes - Chapter I (cont'd.)

20) Ibid., pp.52-53.

21) Quoted by Salvadori, p.226.

22) Karl Kautsky, The Dictatorship of the Proletariat, (Manchester: The National Labour Press, 1919), pp.25-28.

23) V.I. Lenin, "The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky", The Essentials of Lenin, Volume II, (Wesport, Conn.: Hypersion Press Inc., 1973), p.378.

24) Colletti, pp.56-66.

25) Kautsky, The Class Struggle, p.87.

26) Ibid., p.133.

27) Kautsky, The Second Revolution, p.123.

28) Ibid., p.137.

29) Ibid., p.145.

30) Ibid., p.125.

31) Ibid., p.128.

32) Ibid., p.128.

33) Ibid., p.176.

34) Kautsky, The Class Struggle, p.150.

35) Ibid., p.151.

36) Ibid., p.151.

37) Ibid., P.152.

38) Kautsky, The Social Revolution, p.126.

39) Ibid., p.112.

40) Kautsky, The Class Struggle, p.158.

41) Ibid., p.191.

42) Ibid., pp.55-56.

43) Ibid., pp.108-109.

Footnotes - Chapter I (cont'd.)

44) Kautsky, The Social Revolution, p.97.

45) Karl Marx, Capital, Volume III, (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1964), p.792.

46) Kautsky, The Social Revolution, p.207.

47) Ibid., pp.108-110.

48) Ibid., p.110.

49) Kautsky, The Class Struggle, p.191

50) Kautsky, The Social Revolution, p.212.

51) Quoted by Andrew Arato, "The Second International: A Re-examination", Telos, No.12, (Spring, 1976), p.22.

52) V.I. Lenin, The Renegade Kautsky, p.378.

53) Ibid., p.378.

54) Kautsky, The Dictatorship of the Proletariat, p.78.

55) Hal Draper, "Marx on the Dictatorship fo the Proletariat", New Politics, Volume 6, No. 4, p.152.

56) Engels, "Speech at Marx's Graveside", Marx - Engels Reader, p.603.

57) Quoted by Salvadori, p.24.

58) Ibid., p.24.

59) Karl Kautsky, The Dictatorship of the Proletariat, p.75.

60) Karl Kautsky, Colonial Policy: A Marxist Analysis, (Belfast: Athol., 1975), p.180.

61) Ibid., pp.160-180.

62) Karl Kautsky, "Ultra-Imperialism", New Left Review, No.59, (Jan.-Feb.,1970), pp.41-48.

63) Karl Kautsky, The Class Struggle, p.87.

64) Ibid., p.68.

65) Kautsky, The Dictatorship of the Proletariat, p.75.

66) Karl Marx, Selected Writing in Sociology and Philosophy, Ed. T.B. Bollomore and M. Rubel, (New York: McGraw Hill, 1964), p.191.

Footnotes - Chapter I (cont'd.)

67) Nicos Poulantzas, Classes in Contemporary Capitalism, (London: Vesco, 1975), p.229.

68) Ibid., p.229.

69) Karl Marx, quoted by, Martin Nicolaus, "Proletariat and Middle Class in Marx", Studies on the Left, Volume 7, No. 1, (New York, Jan.-Feb., 1967), p.45.

70) Karl Marx, "Conspectus on Bakunin", The Marx - Engels Reader, p.543.

71) Charles Bellelheim, Cultural Revolution and Industrial Organization in China, (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1978), p.8.

72) Karl Marx, "Civil War in France", The Marx - Engels Reader, p.558.

73) Marx and Engels, "The Communist Manifesto", The Marx - Engels Reader, p.332.

CHAPTER II

Lenin and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat

In his polemic with Kautsky over the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat, Lenin represented the orthodox Marxist position. The State and Revolution, in fact, is essentially an elaboration of Marx's and Engels' writings on the socialist state. In "excavating" the classical writings on the dictatorship of the proletariat Lenin indicated, in a crucial historical conjuncture, the contradictions between Marx's and Engel's conception of the socialist state and the conception held by Kautsky and the vast majority of the Second International. However, Lenin did more than rediscover Marx's and Engels' "forgotten" texts on the dictatorship of the proletariat. In many important ways he enriched and developed the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat. To give one example, having recognised that the centre of revolution had shifted away from the advanced capitalist countries, Lenin had to face problems of building socialism in a poor, largely peasant society. In this and other respects Lenin went beyond Marx and Engels.

Notwithstanding Lenin's contribution to the theory of the dictatorship fo the proletariat, his break with Kautsky's conception of socialism was, in one crucial respect, incomplete. Lenin recognised socialism as a period of historical transition

within which capital was "defeated but not destroyed" and communism was born but was "still very feeble".[1] During this period of transition, which would last for a whole historical epoch, Lenin asserted that the class struggle would continue in intensified and unprecedented forms. However, Lenin did not always show adequate recognition of the fact that the productive apparatus developed by capitalism is not structured in a socially neutral way. He did not recognise the role it plays in the reproduction of capital. Consequently, he did not recognise the transformation of the socio-technical division of labour, and the ideological and political relations contained in it, as a fundamental objective of the class struggle. This weakness in Lenin's conception of the dictatorship of the proletariat will be examined shortly. However, let us first consider Lenin's conception of the tasks of socialism vis-a-vis the state.

The Principal Task of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat

In his pamphlet One of the Fundamental Questions of the Revolution, (September, 1917), Lenin wrote: "The key question of every revolution is undoubtedly the question of state power."[2] This is hardly a startling statement and, in fact, it could have just as easily been issued by Kautsky. What is significant is that in discussing this question Lenin is not so much concerned with the problem of capturing

State power as he is with the question of what type of State apparatus the proletariat needs. Lenin argues that the revolution must establish "the dictatorship of the proletariat". What does this mean? Lenin answers that it:

> .....means radically reshaping the entire old apparatus, that bureaucratic apparatus which hampers everything democratic. It means removing this apparatus and substituting for it a new, popular one, ie., a truly democratic apparatus of Soviets, ie., the organized and armed majority of the people... It means allowing the majority of the people the initiative and independence not only in the election of deputies, but also in state administration, in effecting reforms, and various other changes.[3]

In this passage, and in many other places, Lenin argues that the proletariat needs a non-bureaucratic, "truly democratic" State apparatus. The obvious question is: Why? To answer this question one must note that Lenin had a very different conception of the basic nature of proletarian revolution than did Kautsky. As I argued, Kautsky believed that socialism would evolve "smoothly and evenly", and, once the political power of the proletariat was assured, more or less spontaneously, on the basis of the political and economic structures developed within capitalist society. In this context it is interesting to note Lenin's observation that in all previous revolutions the chief work of the masses was destructive; eg., destroying the monarchy, abolishing feudalism, etc.[4] The positive work of creating a new society was left to the bourgeoisie. This, argues Lenin, was a relatively minor task "because the chief organizing force of anarchically built capitalist society is the spontaneously growing and expanding national and inter-

national market."[5]

In contrast to all prior revolutions, socialism can only develop as the product of the conscious struggle of the masses. Lenin concludes from this that what the proletariat needs is a State apparatus which will allow the masses to "engage in independent creative work as the makers of history."[6] Since the distinctive characteristic of the capitalist State is precisely its separation from, and authoritarian relation to, the masses, socialism requires a historically new type of state. These points, of course, need to be discussed at greater length.

I will begin with the question of democracy. A basic element of the Marxist theory of the state - on which both Kautsky and Lenin agreed - is that democracy is never "above" the class struggle. The state is, as Lenin argued, "the product and the manifestation of the irreconcilability of class antagonisms."[7] It follows from this that state power is the power of a single class - even when this power takes the form of a parliamentary democracy. Kautsky argued that the state was an organ of class rule; but, for him, the class nature of the state apparatus depended solely upon which class controlled it. That is to say, there is nothing inherently bourgeois about bourgeois democracy. Thus, Kautsky often spoke of "democracy in general". He even suggested that the development of "pure democracy" was possible within capitalist society.[8] In this context, Lenin declared that: "General talk about freedom,

equality and democracy is in fact but a blind repetition of concepts shaped by the relations of commodity production."[9]

It may be helpful to remember that, for Kautsky:

> Democracy signifies the rule of the majority, and also of the protection of the minority, because it means equal rights and an equal share in all political rights for everybody, to whatever class or party he may belong. (emphasis added)[10]

This conception of democracy is, as Lenin argued, a "blind repetition" of bourgeois ideology because it represents concrete human beings, engaged in specific social relations, as atomized abstract entities - all of whom are equal before the state. Lenin acknowledges that democracy "signifies the formal recognition of equality of all citizens, the equal right of all to determine the structure of, and to administer, the state."[11] But, within bourgeois society "democracy means only formal equality". It is "only formal" because the social situation of the poor and the structure of the state effectively "exclude and squeeze out the poor from politics, from active participation in democracy."[12] Proletarian democracy, on the other hand, is characterized by the direct exercise of political power by the revolutionary masses. This means it must eliminate two essential elements of the capitalist state: the bureaucracy; and the "special apparatus of repression."

In asserting that the form of the proletarian state must facilitate the direct exercise of political power by the masses, Lenin was adhering to the orthodox Marxian position. But why is it

that the proletariat cannot "simply lay hold of the ready made state apparatus" after it has expelled the bourgeoisie? Here it is important to recall that the primary force in the reproduction of capitalist hegemony is not the state; but, rather, it is the material relations and ideological practices within which the masses are held - involving, above-all, the division between intellectual and manual labour. In contrast to the state power of the bourgeoisie, these relations can be "abolished" only over a long period of time. Thus, Lenin argued in Economics and Politics in the Era of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, that capital - which is not "a sum of money or a group of people, but a definite social relation" - is not something that can be overthrown from one day to the next:

> Theoretically, there can be no doubt that between capitalism and communism there lies a definite transition period which must combine the features and properties of both these forms of social economy. This transition period has to be a period of struggle between dying capitalism and nascent communism - or, in other words, between capitalism which has been defeated but not destroyed and communism which has been born but is still very feeble.[13]

Socialism is a period of transition during which capitalism "has been defeated but not destroyed." Capitalism cannot be "destroyed" immediately because social relations which reproduce the conditions for the existence of capital are conditioned by a process of social production that cannot be transformed overnight. In contrast to the feudal mode of production, in the capitalist mode of production the ruling class - and its agents - do play

a vital economic role. This situation is not decisively altered merely by the seizure of state power by the proletariat. In consequence, the proletariat must expropriate the bourgeoisie while utilizing a productive apparatus which forms the material basis of the power of the bourgeoisie. This is the dominant contradiction of socialism, the contradiction that determines the form of the proletarian state.

The transformation of the production relations inherited from capitalism, and of the ideological practices which are inextricably interwoven with them, demands the direct exercise of political power by the proletariat. In light of the inexperience of the direct producers in management and supervisory functions, and considering the capacity of bourgeois "specialists" to engage in economic sabotage, it seems unlikely that this struggle to uproot the bourgeoisie could be waged without at least a temporary drop in economic efficiency.[14] Consequently, the proletariat must organize itself for the direct exercise of political power to conduct a massive organizational, political, and ideological struggle against the bourgeoisie; and, also, to deal with adverse movements within the broad masses which may emerge as a consequence of economic deterioration.[15] For this reason, Lenin stressed in "Left-Wing" Communism, An Infantile Disorder that the proletariat and, in particular, the proletarian party must be organized and disciplined so as to be "capable of watching and influencing the mood of the masses."[16]

For these reasons, and to prevent the emergence of a new bureaucratic elite opposed to the masses, Lenin argued that the proletariat must govern directly. In response to Kautsky's "commonsense" argument that a class can only rule, not govern, Lenin replied: "Any European country will provide Kautsky with examples of government by a ruling class, for instance, by the landowners in the Middle Ages, in spite of their insufficient organization."[17] Socialism, then, is to be characterized by a form of state power analogous to that of feudalism; viz. one in which members of the ruling class exercise political power personally and directly.

The most developed statement of Lenin's conception of the proletarian state, of course, is The State and Revolution.[18] As I have suggested, the status of this book in the Marxist tradition is less a consequence of its theoretical originality than of the fact that it represented an "excavation" of Marx's and Engel's texts on the dictatorship of the proletariat had been almost universally forgotten throughout the Second International. Indeed, in a well documented essay, Marian Sawyer has indicated that it was not until the virtual eve of the Soviet Revolution of 1917 that Lenin broke with Kautsky's conception of the socialist state.[19] However, Lenin did "rediscover" Marx's writing on the Paris Commune before the outbreak of the soviets in 1917. He was, thereby, able to indicate the theoretical meaning and historical significance of the soviets. This, in turn, enabled the

Bolsheviks to seize the leadership of the soviet revolution.

A State of a New Type

In The State and Revolution Lenin asserts, against "the Kautskyites", that the "withering away of the state" is not something which corresponds to a distant stage of communism; but rather, it is something which must begin immediately upon the seizure of power. This implies two things, first, the old state machine must be destroyed and, secondly, the proletariat must build a state "so constituted that it begins to wither away immediately, and cannot but wither away."[20] It is only by the combination of these two processes that the bourgeois state is "smashed".

Since the separate existence of the state is part of a specific system of social production, and since its internal structure reflects the capitalist division of labour and the prevailing class relations, it is not enough for the proletariat, as Althusser puts it, to "simply add to the adjective 'democratic' to each State apparatus".[21] To "smash" the state it is necessary to suppress some aspects of the bourgeois state, to transform others, and to invent altogether new organizational structures. What are the concrete measures Lenin proposed by which to "smash" the state?

In this context, Lenin bases himself largely on Marx's and Engels' analyses of the Paris Commune (and, of course, the historical revolutionary process which was unfolding before

him). Marx described the Commune as "a revolution against the state itself, ..., a resumption of the people, by the people, for the people of its own social life."[22] Lenin quoted a passage from Engels' introduction to The Civil War in France:

> From the very outset the Commune was compelled to recognize that the working class, once come to power, could not go on managing with the old state machine: that in order not to lose again its only just conquered supremacy, this working class must, on the one hand, do away with all the old repressive machinery previously used against itself, and, on the other hand, safeguard itself against its own deputies and officials, by declaring them all, without exception subject to recall at any moment.[23]

The first part of this passage is straightforward. Lenin argued that in "a state of armed workers", in which "the majority of the people itself suppresses its oppressers, a 'special force' for suppression is no longer necessary."[24] That is to say, to the extent that the powers of repression devolve to "the people as a whole" the repressive state apparatus begins to "wither away". The process by which the bureauacracy is "smashed" is tendentially the same, although it is a more complex process.

Lenin argued that different parts of the state machine had to be "smashed" in different ways. Lenin asserts the bureaucracy cannot be abolished immediately, but the process by which it is "smashed" must begin immediately. Toward this end, he ar-

gues in The State and Revolution the Soviets must adopt the specific measures initiated by the Paris Commune; such as the paying of state officials "workmen's wages", all state officials to be subject to immediate recall by the people; the destruction of parliamentarism and its replacement with "proletarian democracy" which abolishes the division of labour between those who make decisions and those who carry them out; the stripping of official posts of all vestiges of elitism and privilege; etc.[25]

Lenin asserts that the need for administration and the need for bourgeois specialists will remain after the proletariat has seized power. However, these specialists will be stripped of all their powers for "bossing" and, in fact, will be subject to the control of armed workers. The role of state officials would thereby be reduced to "carrying out our instructions as responsible, revocable, modestly paid 'foremen and bookkeepers'".[26] Through such measures Lenin hoped bureaucratic careerism would be abolished. Of most importance in this respect, Lenin argues that the masses themselves must carry out whatever tasks of state administration of which they are capable. To the extent that all citizens are bureaucrats for a time, the bureaucracy as such begins to "wither away". Lenin was extremely optimistic in this regard, arguing that the "accounting and control" functions necessary for the first phase of communism had "been simplified by capitalism to the extreme and reduced to ...extraordinarily simple operations -

which any literate person can perform".[27] Of course, as I have noted, Lenin did not expect that the masses would be immediately able to take on all administrative functions.

A Dictatorship of a New Type

If the measures outlined above could have been carried out in the manner Lenin foresaw in The State and Revolution they would, indeed, have constituted the creation of a qualitatively new type of democracy. However, Lenin was insistent that the socialist state would also be a qualitatively new type of dictatorship. It is self-evident that if the proletariat has taken state power it has effectively displaced the bourgeoisie at the political level. Lenin realized, however, that the bourgeoisie was not yet "uprooted, not yet destroyed, and not yet even utterly broken." He concluded from this that the proletariat, in socialism, must face "a new and higher form of struggle against the bourgeoisie."[28] In "Left-Wing Communism, An Infantile Disorder Lenin stated:

> The dictatorship of the proletariat is a persistent struggle - bloody and bloodless, violent and peaceful, military and economic, educational and administrative - against the forces and traditions of the old society. The force of habit of millions and tens of millions is a most terrible force..., without a party capable of watching and influencing the mood of the masses, it is impossible to conduct such a struggle successfully.29

This brings us to what is perhaps Lenin's most important and, I think, most original contribution to the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

We have seen that Kautsky's political strategy and his conception of socialism were based on a mechanistic and economistic conception of societal development. In particular, it will be remembered, that Kautsky considered the ever increasing extension of the wage form as a manifestation of a proportional increase in the size of the working class. In contrast to Kautsky, Lenin based his political strategy and conception of socialism on a dialectical analysis of the specific conjuncture within which he acted and a global analysis of the current state of capitalism. On the basis of such analyses Lenin came to two conclusions of fundamental importance. First, capitalism does not lead to the linear development of society toward socialism; but, rather, capitalism evokes contradictory tendencies within society and within the industrial working class itself.[30] Secondly, Lenin realized that imperialism was not, as Kautsky argued, merely a "policy" of finance capital; but, rather, it constituted a distinct phase of capitalism which required an adaptation in the tactics of socialist parties. Although I cannot go into a full-scale analysis of Lenin's theory of imperialism, the labour aristocracy, etc., a few remarks in this direction are essential.

In Imperialism and the Split in Socialism and in Imperialism,

the Highest Stage of Capitalism Lenin demonstrated the split within the European socialist movement to be a consequence of contradictions within the working class, contradictions evoked by the imperialist stage of capitalism. In this context Lenin quoted Engels' observations that the English proletariat "is actually becoming more and more bourgeois, so that this most bourgeois of all nations is apparently aiming ultimately at the possession of...a bourgeois proletariat alongside the bourgeoisie."[31] Engels argued that England's ability to create "something like an alliance" between the bourgeois and, at least a section of, the working class was a consequence of its monopoly position in the world market. Lenin argued that, since Engels' time, capitalism had "grown into a world system of colonial oppression and of the financial strangulation of the overwhelming majority of the population of the world by a handful of 'advanced' countries."[32] Lenin concluded from this that, whereas in Engels' time only England had the ability to "bribe" a section of its working class, in the imperialist stage of capitalism this ability is extended to a number of advanced countries; notably, France, Germany and the United States.

Lenin argued that only a relatively small section of the working class, the labour aristocracy, could be "bribed" by the bourgeoisie. This reflects the fact that Lenin's analysis of the labour aristocracy rests not only on a global analysis of capitalism, but, also on an analysis of relations of different

groups within the working class to the means of production and to each other. The labour aristocracy is essentially a monopoly within a monopoly. As Martin Nicolaus states: "It consists of workers who benefit from structures that exclude the competition of other workers, within a capitalism structured to exclude the competition of other capitalists."[33] Let me explain.

In no capitalist country has more than between one fifth and one third of the working class been organised in trade unions.[34] Within the section of organised workers there is a relatively small elite which, owing to its special skill, its relation to the means of production, is able to strike a tacit alliance with capitalists or, at least, act with effectiveness vis-a-vis its employers in defending its particular interests. The position of the labour aristocracy encouraged it to be conservative and chauvinistic. The economic privilege of the labour aristocracy, i.e. its enjoyment of "surplus wages" which come out of imperialism's "super profits", rests on 1) the maintenance of the relations of domination between the metropole and the colonized lands, and 2) the maintenance of its dominance over other elements in the working class, e.g. radical and ethnic minorities, women, the unemployed, etc.

As I have said, Lenin argued that the labour aristocracy could only be a relatively small group. However, Lenin also argued that this group was permitted, and tacitly encouraged, to play the role of the "vanguard" of the working people; e.g. it

is given privileged access to means of political communication. For this reason, Lenin argued the aristocracy could effect a "decay" in the working class as a whole.

Lenin drew two fundamental strategic conclusions from his analysis of the relation between opportunism, the labour aristocracy, and imperialism. First, since revisionist, "bourgeois labour parties" have a material basis in the structure of imperialism, they cannot be expected to disappear or to return to the cause of revolutionary socialism.[36] Secondly, revolutionary socialists must "go down lower and deeper to the real masses."[37]

It goes without saying that if Lenin recognized that sections of the organized working class would not support a revolutionary socialist party he had no illusion that all non-proletarian wage earners could be won to socialism before the revolution. Lenin argued that in every capitalist country a large section of the population is made up of non-proletarian elements which, as a result of their economic position, tend to be "vacillating" and, in fact, generally follow the bourgeois or petty-bourgeois parties. Lenin adds that within capitalism the bourgeoisie controls "a gigantic apparatus of falsehood and deception" with which "to hoodwink the masses of workers and peasants to stulify their minds and so forth." Lenin concluded from this that the masses, disunified and "crushed" by capitalism, are unable to "decide in advance the extremely complicated political question: to be with the working class

or the bourgeoisie."[38] Lenin concluded from this that parliamentary elections, while they serve as "an index of the level reached by the various classes in understanding their problems," cannot serve as a means of introducing socialism.

Kautsky, in Terrorism and Communism (1919), responded to Lenin's arguments by stating that to declare the impossibility of a socialist majority "means considering the workers as a gang of base and illiterate cowards; it means proclaiming the failure of the proletarian cause."[39] Lenin, of course, never argued that workers were cowards or that, as Kautsky suggests, they directly "sell-out" to the bourgeoisie. He did argue that the social position of workers did not automatically orient them toward socialism. Beyond this, Lenin argued a section of the working class, "in a thousand different ways, direct and indirect, overt and covert", could be detached from the socialist movement.

Of course, Kautsky's failure to reply in a convincing way to Lenin's argument does not establish Lenin's correctness. What does substantiate Lenin's position is the history of this century. No revolutionary party - one calling for an immediate and radical change in production relations - has come to power by electoral means. No such party has been able to surpass an upper limit of about 25 per cent of the voting population; i.e. roughly the same proportion of the electorate won by the Bolsheviks in 1917.[40] Naturally, this is not to say that Lenin's

analysis is complete or above criticism.

Eric Hobsbawm has suggested that Lenin was too optimistic in his assertion that only a small section of the working class could enjoy the "surplus wages" afforded by imperialism.[41] Moreover, there is no doubt that Lenin did not pay enough attention to other influences on the consciousness of the working class, in particular, the effects of modern productive technology, the pervasive influence of the bourgeois state and bourgeois ideology. However, the point is that Lenin indicated the type of conjunctural analysis which must, as he said, form "the pivot of the tactics of the labour movement" in the imperialist era. Secondly, Lenin indicated concrete reasons for believing that the dictatorship of the proletariat could not be established by a majority of the population. This fact was of decisive importance in Lenin's conception of the tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In The Dictatorship of the Proletariat Kautsky condemned the Bolsheviks' seizure of power by force and their subsequent dispersal of the Constituent Assembly. The Bolsheviks, stated Kautsky, believed that socialism "can be brought about without the co-operation of the great mass of the people."[42] Actually, Lenin did not assert that socialism could be "brought about" without the co-operation of the bulk of the population. He did argue that this co-operation could only be won by a persistent struggle - "violent and peaceful, military and economic, educational and administrative" - after the dictatorship of

the proletariat had been introduced:

> In order to win the majority of the population to its side the proletariat must, in the first place, overthrow the bourgeoisie and seize state power; secondly, it must introduce Soviet power and completely smash the old state apparatus, whereby it immediately undermines the rule, prestige and influence of the bourgeoisie and petty-bourgeois compromisers over the non-proletarian working people. Thirdly, it must entirely destroy the influence of the bourgeoisie and petty-bourgeois compromisers over the majority of the non-proletarian masses by satisfying their economic needs in a revolutionary way at the expense of the exploited.43

Here Lenin breaks with all reformism and evolutionism. However, it should not be concluded from this that Lenin, as Kautsky argued, was a "Blanquiist" who believed socialism could be made "from above" without the co-operation of the great mass of people. Lenin was insistent that the Bolsheviks could not "steam roller" the peasants into socialism; but, rather, it was the duty of the proletariat "to leave it to the non-proletarian masses themselves to get rid of "their" vacillation as a result of their own experience".44 Lenin was convinced that when the non-proletarian masses can compare the conditions under the dictatorship of the proletariat to those of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie they would be convinced "by their own experience" of the superiority of the former. In a word, Lenin realised that the bourgeois state could not be overthrown by means of electoral majority. On the other hand, Lenin argued that progress in building socialism could not be made in opposition to the bulk of the population, including the section of the masses outside the proletariat. We shall see that this position was

at the heart of Lenin's conception of collectivization.

Collectivization

After the Civil War had been comsummated, the dominant political and economic problem the proletarian dictatorship faced was the problem of peasant agriculture. Lenin's writings after 1919 show an almost obsessive concern with this problem. Lenin argued that petty-commodity production constituted a "very sound, deep-rooted basis for capitalism, a basis on which capitalism persists or arises anew in a bitter struggle against communism."[45] Similarly, in "Left-Wing" Communism, An Infantile Disorder he writes that "small production engenders capitalism". Lenin goes on to note that petty commodity producers:

> ... encircle the proletariat on every side with a petty-bourgeois atmosphere, which permeates and corrupts the proletariat and causes constant relapses among the proletariat into petty-bourgeois spinelessness, disunity, individualism, and alternate moods of exaltation and dejection.[46]

However, even though Lenin considered this problem "a life and death struggle" for the proletariat, he rejected the arguments of those Bolsheviks who advocated immediate collectivization and exploitation of the peasantry as a basis for "primitive socialist accumulation". Lenin regarded collectivization as a long-run imperative, but one that could not be accomplished by dictatorial means:

> The abolition of classes means not only driving out the landlords and capitalists - that we accomplished with comparative ease - it also means abolishing the small commodity producers, and they cannot be driven out, or crushed; we must live in harmony with them; they can (and must) be remoulded and re-educated only by very prolonged, slow, cautious organizational work. 47

Lenin thought collectivization was desirable only if accompanied by the production of advanced farm machinery and a cultural revolution among the peasantry. Various political projects in different types of collective agriculture and competition between collective and private sectors were intended not only to ensure the efficiency of collective farming; but, most importantly, to convince the peasants, through their own experience, of the superiority of collectivization. 48

Lenin's conception of collectivization is not only superior to the Stalinist type of collectivization, which threw Soviet agriculture into a crisis for decades; it marked an advance in the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat. It marked an advance in that it recognised that petty-commodity production could not be abolished by statist (authoritarian) methods; but rather, it had to be the object of decades of educational, ideological, organizational and political work among the peasantry.

Lenin's conception of the relation between the collectivization process and the New Economic Policy reveals a basic as-

pect of his conception of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

For Lenin, the dictatorship of the proletariat was a state and state power is the power of one class. However, this does not mean that the dictatorship of the proletariat is the dictatorship of the working class over the masses in general. For Lenin, it is alliance between classes in which the proletariat plays the leading role. Lenin declared that whoever "has not understood this from reading Marx's Capital has understood nothing in Marx, understood nothing in Socialism, ...".[53] In his closing speech at the Eleventh Congress of the Bolshevik Party, April 1922, Lenin asserted that the N.E.P. must be understood not only as a "retreat" needed to restore order to the economy; but rather, it had to be used as a means of establishing socialism:

> The main thing now is to advance as an immeasurably wider and larger mass. and only together with the peasantry, proving to them by deeds, in practice, by experience, that we are learning and that we shall learn to assist them, to lead them forward. 50

Lenin's conception of collectivization represented a resolution, at the level of theory, of the dominant (domestic) contradiction that the Soviet state had to face in the immediate post-Civil War years. However, the long-run, determinant contradiction of the era of the dictatorship of the proletariat does not lie in the sphere of petty-commodity production. It lies, as I have argued, in the struggle to overthrow and

replace capitalist relations in the sphere of social production; i.e., in enterprises which were the first to be formally collectivized.

Moreover, because there is no separation between the political sphere and the economic sphere once the means of social production are under state control, the failure to transform capitalist relations within the sphere of production could only have serious "degenerating" or bureaucratizing effects on the Soviet state. This is a problem which Lenin, for lack of time and as a consequence of historical limitations, was not able to resolve, even at the level of theory.

Lenin and Socialist Revolution in the Sphere of Production

In 1920 Lenin stated, "Dictatorship is a big, harsh and bloody word, one which expresses a relentless life-and-death struggle between two classes, two worlds, two historical epochs."[51] In The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government (April, 1918) Lenin declared that the proletariat had to "suspend" its "offensive" in this struggle. Lenin argued that measures were necessary which constituted "a retreat from the principles of the Paris Commune."[52] This "retreat" was dictated by the disastrous state in which the Civil War left the economy. By the end of the Civil War, Russian industry produced only one-fifth of the goods it had in 1913; the coal mines turned out less than one-tenth; and the iron foundaries only one-

fortieth of their past output; the railways were destroyed; etc.[53] Under these circumstances Lenin wrote that it was the duty of Communists to explain frankly:

> ... how and why we took this step backward, and then publicly discussing what means are available for making up for lost time, means of educating the people and learning from experience, learning together with the people how to build socialism.[54]

Yet this was not always done. Lenin himself, as Colletti states, too often made a virtue of necessity, adopting means which may well have served the revolution in a particular context without "always making explicit the historical and political limits, in terms of which these means were imposed and derived their validity".[55] Consequently, the contradictions contained in Bolshevik practice were not always recognized and the means necessary to rectify the situation went undiscussed, and undiscovered. In this context, the goal of transforming real production relations was, in effect, lost sight of and the raising of the level of the industrial productivity came to be presented as the essential, if not the sole requirement left to achieve before socialism would have a secure foundation. In The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government Lenin states:

> In every socialist revolution, after the proletariat has solved the problem of capturing power ..., there necessarily comes to the forefront the fundamental task of creating a social system superior to capitalism, namely, raising the productivity of labour.[56]

Lenin goes on to state that the work to raise the productivity of labour will "require the use of compulsion, so that the slogan of the dictatorship of the proletariat shall not be desecrated by the practice of a lily-livered proletarian government." I will now briefly discuss the basic measures which Lenin advocated as a means of raising the productivity of labour. In his pamphlet, "Left-Wing" Childishness and the Petty-Bourgeois Mentality (1919) Lenin gave an indication of what these means were to be:

> In 1918 Germany and Russia have become the most striking embodiment of the material realization of the economic, the productive and the socio-economic conditions for socialism, on the one hand, the political conditions, on the other hand (the economic) ... our task is to study the state capitalism of the Germans, to spare no effort in copying it. Our task is to hasten this copying even more than Peter I hastened the copying of the Western culture by barbarian Russia, and we must not hesitate to use barbarous methods in fighting barbarism.[58]

What was to be copied from German state capitalism was "the principle of discipline, organization and harmonious co-operation" based upon the "most modern mechanized industry, the most rigid system of audibility and control."[59] This meant the introduction of measures such as productivity norms for each worker, re-introduction of piece-work, draconian enforcement of labour discipline, and the reinforcement of the power and privilege of bourgeois specialists. Lenin admitted that many serious errors had been made under the authoritarian structure of War Communism. He also realised that the introduction of capitalist means of organization, accounting and

management was incompatible with the independent power of working class organizations.[60] "Democracy", argued Lenin, "is a category proper only to the political sphere. Industry is indispensable, democracy is not."[61] Lenin never explicitly advocated the "satisfaction" of trade unions. However, he made statements that, in effect, gave support to the transformation of trade unions from the independent organizations of the workers into "transmission belts" of state policy. In The Role of Trade Unions Under the N.E.P. Lenin argued that trade unions must collaborate "closely and constantly with the government in all the political and economic activities which are guided by the class-conscious vanguard of the working class - the Communist Party."[62] Similarly, the fact that trade unions had ceased to be a means of educating the masses in administration, through direct experience, is indicated by the following passage:

> It is absolutely essential that all authority in the factories should be concentrated in the hand of management - under these circumstances any direct intervention by trade unions in the management of enterprises must be regarded as positively harmful and impermissible.[63]

Just as the Bolsheviks found it necessary to retain czarist military officers in the Red Army and, in fact, to free them from the control of political commissars appointed by the party; they found it necessary to use bourgeois specialists, and to free them from the control of "armed workers". To do so may have been necessary for a specific length of time; but, this "retreat" was never corrected.

This was a "retreat from the principles of the Paris Commune" that Lenin had elaborated in The State and Revolution. It is true that even in The State and Revolution Lenin's conception of how to transform bourgeois social relation at the level of production is relatively undeveloped. However, Lenin did indicate that "large-scale production" would be organized by the workers themselves; bourgeois managers and technicians would be subjected to the collective control of the workers; all "specialists" were to receive workmen's wages; and they were to be replaced as soon as the experience and training of workers would allow.[64] These principles were only a beginning, but they were the necessary beginning without which the struggle to uproot bourgeois power at the level of production could not progress. Since this "retreat" was not corrected, old production relations could be reconstituted and reproduced thereby establishing a space within the sphere of production for an exploiting class.

Inspite of the Bolsheviks' intensions, the more the workers were restricted to a passive role the greater was the ease with which the social power of bourgeois specialists was consolidated. The rule of factories by the personal authority of factory managers; overreliance on material incentives, the overindentifications of party and state, the abolition of non-Bolsheviks groups in the Soviets, the abolition of the traditional right of Bolsheviks to engage in ideological struggles through forming factions, and similar measures, greatly helped the "victory of the bureaucracy".[65] Everything

seems to indicate Lenin believed the growing threat of bureaucratism and the isolation of the Bolsheviks from the masses could be offset by increased ideological rigour on the part of the party and increased discipline inside, and outside, the party. Perhaps, it was partly as a result of the general suppression of critical debate that the contradictions inherent in the adoption of capitalist methods of organization of labour by a socialist regime never came fully to light and, hence, measures which would be necessary to correct this "retreat" were not discussed.

Taylorism

Let us examine the example of "Taylorism". Taylorism was a system of labour management developed by Frederick Taylor. It was an attempt to apply scientific methods to the problems of the labour process in modern capitalist industries. However, as Harry Braverman writes, the "scientific management" of Frederick Taylor lacks the characteristics of true science since its analysis starts from:

> ... the capitalist point of view, from the point of view of the management of a refractory work force in a setting of antagonistic social relations. It does not attempt to discover and confront the cause of this condition, but accepts it as inexorable given ... It investigates not labour in general, but the adaptation of labour to the needs of capital. It enters the workplace not as the representative of science, but as the representative of management masquerading in the trappings of science.66

The problem which Taylorism addresses is that of control over alienated labour; viz., wage labour. Taylor argued that, under what he called "ordinary management", management had little knowledge of the work process, and, consequently, little direct control over it. This inevitably resulted in "soldiering", ie., the tendency for workers to establish a work pace well below their capability.[67] Taylor concluded from this that: "All possible brain work should be removed from the shop and centered in the planning or laying-out department."[68] That is to say, if management is effectively to control the labour process the skill, conceptualization, and planning involved in production must be separated from the direct execution of tasks in the labour process. The "labour process" is no longer dominated by living labour; the unity, direction and purpose of the process are external to the labourer. This is a result of the fact that, as Braverman notes, control over the labour process passes into the hands of management, "not only in a formal sense but by the control and dictation of each step of the process, including its mode of performance."[69]

Within capitalism, management has always had the right to control labour. What Taylor advocated was making this control more effective by making it more direct. This was done, first of all, by having management dictate the <u>precise</u> manner in which the work was to be done. This was made possible by the

reduction of the work process to a series of mechanistic, atomised, motions which are easily measured by management. Taylor argued that the work process must be constantly supervised by the representatives of management. Finally, development of the work process is made the exclusive domain of management. In fact, workers are prohibited from altering the work process in any way, e.g., altering the position or arrangement of machinery. Workers are limited to the mindless execution of motions determined by management. They consequently lose any conception of the production process as a whole, of its technological principles.

Lenin was very impressed with the work of Taylor. He argued the Bolsheviks must organise the "study and teaching of the Taylor system and systematically try it out and adapt it to our end."[70] According to Lenin:

> The Taylor system ... is a combination of the refined bestiality of bourgeois exploitation and a number of the greatest scientific achievements in the field of analysing mechanical motions during work, the elimination of superfluous and awkward motions, the elaboration of correct methods of work, the introduction of the best system of accounting and control, etc. The possibility of building socialism depends exactly upon our success in combining Soviet power and Soviet organization of administration with the up-to-date achievements of capitalism.[71]

The idea that the "scientific" aspects of Taylorism could be separated from its exploitative aspects is undialectical. Lenin failed to realise that there is no mode of work in

general. That is to say, just as the state is not above the class struggle, so the mode of work is modulated - even its "scientific" aspects - by class struggle. In Capital Marx notes that in modern industry science is "a productive force distinct from labour and presses it into the service of capital."[72] Science appropriated by capital never exists in a pure or neutral form; but, rather, it is articulated to a certain ensemble of social relations - capital. The question of the relation between science and the dominant ideology is one that cannot be discussed here. It is enough for us to note that Taylorism is an instrument of the domination of capital not only because it facilitated increasing the intensity of work to levels which could not be maintained without strain; but, even more fundamentally, it was such because the "correct methods of work" developed according to it were intended radically to increase the division between mental and manual labour and, thereby, the social power of management over labour. The "up-to-date achievements" of capitalism could not be separated from the social context in which they were developed. Taylorism, which was intended to "cheapen" labour by emptying it of all skill, technique, and rationality, could not be utilized for the opposite purpose; viz., to increase the workers' control and understanding of the social processes they were engaged in.

Finally, it should be noted that the place of labour is not only a place where social relations are reproduced, relations

which tend to reproduce themselves throughout society; it is also a place where ideas about these relations are formed. Taylorism presents capitalist production relations as a technical matter removed from political discourse. Taylorism represented an ideological attack against the nascent American trade union movement. Recent studies have indicated that Taylorism was most strongly embraced in countries faced with intensified class struggles.[74] Taylorism, with its emphasis on the total authority of management and complete submission of the direct producers was intended to reinforce the class positions of the bourgeoisie and the direct producers. Its adoption by Soviet enterprises had tendentially the same effect.

In light of this, it is not surprising that Soviet industrialization copied, in the strongest sense of the word, the capitalist mode of organization and technology. The fact that bourgeois specialists were eventually replaced by specialists of working class origin mattered little. These specialists were placed in the same relations of authority that their predecessors had occupied. The consolidation in the factories of relations of authority and command, which was implied by the adoption of Taylorism, between administration and the workers, provided fertile ground for the growth of bureaucratism with which Lenin was so concerned in his last years.[75]

Conclusions

Lenin's conception of the dictatorship of the proletariat marks a decisive break with the Marxism of the Second International. Perhaps most important in this regard was Lenin's realisation that socialism must be characterized by a continuation of the class struggle. In light of a number of considerations, e.g. the international connections of the bourgeoisie, Lenin argued that the bougeoisie could not be expected to accept its fate peacefully. Of even more importance was Lenin's argument that the class struggle would continue - in various unprecedented forms - even after the bourgeoisie had been expropriated.

The essential reason why Lenin argued that the class struggle must continue, even after the bourgeoisie had been defeated, is that he realised the necessity of "abolishing" social relations, institutional structures, "habits", and ideology which, otherwise, tend to constitute the material basis for the reproduction of an exploiting class. Lenin's analysis, in this context, is most developed with regard to the "smashing" the capitalist state apparatus and the problem of petty-commodity production. Lenin realised that if the masses were to "engage in independent creative work as the markers of history" they needed to be organized for the direct exercise of political power. For this reason, Lenin argued that the dictatorship of the proletariat must be characterized by a fundamentally new type of state apparatus - viz., mass democracy. In so

arguing Lenin was not only asserting the orthodox Marxist position. He was, more importantly, giving articulation to a historical tendency which has been repeated by every socialist revolution, viz., the tendency of the masses to subordinate state power to their collective control thereby initiating the long process by which the state is abolished.

On the basis of his study of imperialism, Lenin realised that the centre of revolution had "shifted to the East". Lenin explained that imperialism allowed monopoly capitalism to display its contradictions by "bribing" a section of the working class. On the other hand, imperialism intensified contradictions in poor, largely agrarian countries such as Russia. The problem of building socialism in a country in which the vast bulk of the population lay outside the working class is one which Marx and Engels, as a result of historical limitations, and Kautsky, as a result of the mechanistic nature of his Marxism, never addressed. Considering that almost all attempts to build socialism having taken place in poor, largely peasant countries, Lenin's analysis of this problem must be considered as one of his essential contributions to the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Lenin broke with the <u>ouvrieriste</u> tendency, which dates back to Lassalle, to consider as one reactionary mass that section of the population outside the working class. Lenin realised that the working class could only build socialism in <u>co-operation</u> with the peasantry. Lenin argued that it was only through "their own experience" that the peasants could be won to socialism. The

socialist state cannot impose the "correct" policy on the non-proletarian masses. The building of socialism could only proceed on the basis of the experience and consciousness of the masses. In a country such as Russia this means that the working class must form a close alliance with the non-proletarain masses. Since such an alliance is political in character, its consolidation must be considered as one of primary tasks of the proletarain party in building socialism.

The fact that the Bolsheviks were not able to form a close working alliance with the peasantry does not detract from the theoretical importance of Lenin's approach to the problem. Similarly, the fact that, in the conditions which followed as a consequence of the civil war, years of imperialist war and foreign intervention, the state could not be "smashed", does not alter the historical importance of Lenin's recognition of the necessity of building a fundamentally new type of state apparatus. However, the historical limitations of the Soviet Revolution did have at least one corresponding limitation in Lenin's conception of socialism.

Neither Lenin nor the Soviet Revolution addressed in a concrete way the problem of abolishing the capitalist division of labour and the social relations based on it. In fact, Lenin did not break with Kautsky's conception of the organization of the labour process and productive technology as being socially and politically neautral. Soviet industrialization utilized an organization of labour and productive technology only marginally different from

that of capitlaism. Until relatively recently this tendency was generally taken for granted. Whether or not this developed represents an inevitable characteristic of socialism is a question I shall address in the last chapter.

Footnotes

Chapter II

1) V.I. Lenin, "Economics and Politics in the Era of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat", Collected Works (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1954), Volume 30, p.107.

2) V.I. Lenin, "One of the Fundamental Questions of the Revolution", Collected Works, (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1954), Volume 25, p.366.

3) Ibid., p.368.

4) V.I. Lenin, "Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Governement", Collected Works, (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1954), Volume 27, p.230.

5) Ibid., p.230.

6) Ibid., p.243.

7) V.I. Lenin, The State and Revolution, (Peking: Foreign Language Press, 1973), p.7.

8) Karl Kautsky, The Dictatorship of the Proletariat, (Manchester: The National Labour Press, 1919), pp.5-10.

9) Lenin, Economics and Politics in the Era of the Dictatorship of the of the Proletariat, p.116.

10) Kautsky, The Dictatorship of the Proletariat, p.133.

11) Lenin, The State and Revolution, pp.118-9.

12) Lenin, Economics and Politics in the Era of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, p.107.

13) Ibid., p.107.

14) Arghiri Emmanuel, "The State and Transition", New Left Review, No.113-114, (London, April, 1979), p.124.

15) Ibid., pp.124-6.

16) V.I. Lenin, "Left-Wing" Communism, An Infantile Disorder, (Peking: Foreign Language Press, 1973), p.32.

17) V.I. Lenin, "The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky", Collected Works, (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1965), Volume 28, P.241.

Footnotes - Chapter II (cont'd.)

18) It is sometimes suggested that this work is extraneous to the corpus of Lenin's thought. I do not believe this to be the case. However, I cannot enter into this problem here.

19) Marian Sawyer, "The Genesis of State and Revolution", The Socialist Register, 1972, Eds.R. Miliband and M. Saville, (London: The Merlin Press, 1972), pp.209-215.

20) Lenin, The State and Revolution, p.28.

21) Louis Althusser, "The Historic Significance of the Twenty-Second Congress", Etienne Balibar, The Dictatorship of the Proletariat, (London: N.L.B., 1977), p.207.

22) Karl Marx, "First Draft of the Civil War in France", The First International and After, Ed. David Fernbach, (London: Penguin, 1974), p.249.

23) Friedrich Engels, Introduction to "The Civil War in France", The Marx-Engels Reader, Ed. R.C. Tucker, (New York: W.W. Norton, 1972), p.526.

24) Lenin, The State and Revolution, pp. 50-60.

25) Ibid., p.58

26) Ibid., p.120

27) Ibid., p.120.

28) Lenin, Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government, p.245.

29) Lenin, "Left-Wing" Communism, An Infantile Disorder, p.32.

30) See Lenin's analyses of imperialism cited below.

31) V.I. Lenin, "Imperialism and the Split in Socialism", Collected Works, (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1954), Volume 23, p.359.

32) V.I. Lenin, Imperialism the Highest Stage of Capitalism, (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1976), p.11.

33) Martin Nicholaus, "The Theory of the Labour Aristocracy", Monthly Review, Volume 21, No.11, (New York, April, 1970), p.95.

34) Ibid., p.97.

35) Ibid., p.96.

36) Lenin, Imperialism the Highest Stage of Capitalism, p.120.

Footnotes - Chapter II (cont'd.)

37) Ibid., p.120.

38) V.I. Lenin, "The Constituent Assembly Elections and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat", Collected Works, (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1954), Volume 30, p.267.

39) Karl Kautsky, Terrorism and Communism, (London: National Labour Press, 1920), pp.10-30.

40) Arghiri Emmanuel, New Left Review, p.120.

41) Eric Hobsbawm, "Lenin and the Aristocracy of Labour", Monthly Review, Volume 21, No.22, (New York, April, 1970), pp.55-57.

42) Kautsky, The Dictatorship fo the Proletariat, p.89.

43) Lenin, The Constituent Assembly Elections and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, pp.265-266.

44) Lenin, Economics and Politics in the Era of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, p.110.

45) Lenin, "Left-Wing" Communism, An Infantile Disorder, p.32.

46) Ibid., pp.32-36.

47) Ibid., p.36

48) Nicolaus Krasso, Trotsky, (St. Louis, Mo.: New Critics Press, 1972), p.36.

49) V.I. Lenin, "The Role of the Trade Unions Under the N.E.P.", Collected Works, (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1954), Volume 33, p.326.

50) Lenin, The Elections to the Constituent Assembly and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, p.355.

51) Ibid., p.343

52) Lenin, Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government, p.249.

53) Isaac Deutscher, The Prophet Unarmed, (New Tork: Vintage, 1959), p.4.

54) Lenin, Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government, p.257.

55) Lucio Colletti, "Lenin's State and Revolution", Revolution and Class Struggle, Ed. Robin Blackurn, (Sussex: Harvester Press, 1978), p.179.

56) Lenin, Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government, pp.257-260.

Footnotes - Chapter II (cont'd.)

57) V.I. Lenin, "'Left-Wing' Communism and the Petty-Bourgeois Mentality", Collected Works, (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1965), pp.339-40.

58) Ibid., pp.330-40.

59) Ibid., p.163.

60) Krasso, Trotsky, p.25.

61) Lenin, The Role of the Trade Unions Under the N.E.P., p.27.

62) Ibid., p.190.

63) Lenin, quoted by Michael Albert, What Is To Be Undone, (Boston: Porter Sargent Publishers, 1974), p.66.

64) Lenin, The State and Revolution, P.58.

65) Krasso, Trotsky, p.55.

66) Harry Braverman, Labor and Monopoly Capital, (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1974), p.86.

67) Ibid., p.101.

68) Ibid., p.113.

69) Ibid., p.100.

70) Lenin, Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government, p.259.

71) Ibid., p.261.

72) Karl Marx, Capital, (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1959), pp.361 ff.

73) See the work of Dominique Lecourt, Marxism and Epistemology, (London: N.L.B., 1975).

74) Michael Burawoy, "Toward a Marxist Theory of the Labour Process", Politicas and Society, Volume 8, No.304, (Los Altos, 1978), p.288.

75) See Moshe, Lewin, Lenin's Last Struggle, (New York: Pantheon, 1968).

CHAPTER III

Social Production Relations and Historical Transition

In the foregoing chapters I have asserted that the transformation of social production relations must be considered an essential task of the class struggle under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Kautsky's and Lenin's inadequate recognition of this task indicates an economistic/technicist tendency in their thought. I believe the cause of this theoretical inadequacy to be a failure fully to understand Marx's concept of "social production relations" - particularly, with regard to the capitalist mode of production.

In Capital Marx revealed that the capitalist production process was a process which simultaneously produced use-value and surplus-value. The capitalist production process, in that it involves the transformation of nature, is a socio-technical process. At the same time, in that it involves the extraction of surplus labour, it is a process of exploitation and class division. In this chapter I will explore some of the basic implications of Marx's theory of the dual nature of the capitalist production process. However, before proceeding to do so, it may be pertinent to point out that there has been a long tendency within Marxism to misunderstand, or to deny, the dual nature of the social production relations under capitalism. For example, Kautsky stated:

> The production of the means of subsistence and production of men are two essentially different processes, the relationship between the labourer and things, technique, like that between the consumer and the things he consumes, is clearly something quite different from the relation entered into by men in the labour process, in the economy. Only the latter is social, the former are not. (emphasis added)1

For Kautsky, there was no intrinsic connection between capitalist production relations and the development of productive technique. He did maintain that, at different stages of their development, the forces of production could be accelerated or retarded in their growth by the relations of production. In fact, Kautsky believed he was living in an era in which the productive forces could no longer develop within the context of capitalist property relations. Kautsky argued that this contradiction would inevitably lead to the "breakdown of existing society." That is, it would lead "to unbearable conditions for the mass of the population, which leave it only a choice between passive degeneration and the active overthrow of the existing system of ownership." (emphasis added)[2] As this statement implies, Kautsky identified capitalism primarily with a specific "system of ownership", rather than with (in the strict sense) an actual mode of production.

Kautsky believed that once the productive forces were freed from the fetters of the capitalist "system of ownership" they would undergo a vast and rapid development. Kautsky argued that the division between intellectual and manual labour had "become a

technical necessity" which socialism could not eliminate.[3] On the contrary, it was the full development of the productive forces inherited from capitalism which would make the abolition of the division of labour eventually possible. In a word, Kautsky made the development of the productive forces (which he understood essentially as productive "technique"), rather than the class struggle, the primary factor in the progress of socialism toward communism.

The situation with Lenin is more complex. He recognised socialism as a contradictory combination of various modes of production within which the class struggle would continue for a "whole historical epoch". On the other hand, in The State and Revolution - precisely where Lenin broke with Kautsky's conception of the socialist state - he predicted that the "expropriation of the capitalists will inevitably result in an enormous development of the productive forces of human society."[4] Following Kautsky, Lenin presented the development of these "productive forces" as the determinant factor in the advance toward communism. We have seen that Lenin endorsed capitalistic methods of organization of labour and even coercion as a means of accelerating this development.

But Lenin's position was not ossified. Charles Bettelheim has suggested that in the last years of his life Lenin was in the process of "rectifying" his conception of the relation between the productive apparatus inherited from capitalism and socialism.[5]

In his polemic against Trotsky and Bukharin over the question of the trade unions, Lenin asserted: "Politics must take precedence over economics." He explained:

> Trotsky and Bukharin make as though they are concerned for the growth of production whereas we have nothing but formal democracy in mind. This picture is wrong, because the only formulation of the issue (which the Marxist standpoint allows) is: without a correct political approach to the matter the given class will be unable to stay on top, and, consequently, will be incapable of solving its production problem either.6

Lenin asserted that there could be no abstract distinction between the "political" and "economic" questions of socialism. In fact, he went so far as to give the warning that the "wrong attitude" on an apparently "economic" problem could "ruin the Soviet power and topple the dictatorship of the proletariat."[7] Nevertheless, Lenin's "rectification" was not complete. Lenin failed to recognise the intrinsic connection between the technical production relations and social production relations of capitalism. His assumption of the essentially "neutral" or "technical" character of the productive apparatus developed by capitalism determined the limits of his analysis of socialism.[8]

Lenin's "rectification" was not taken up by Stalin. Stalin expressed a position that was commonplace within the Second International. He believed that the socialization and centralization of production under capitalism heralded, and prepared the "economic base" for, the building of socialism. For Stalin, like Kautsky, production relations are essentially an element of the

"superstructure" which are altered in accordance with the development of the "productive forces", (which Stalin reduced to the "instruments of production."):

> First the productive forces of society change and develop, and then, depending on these changes and in conformity with them, men's relations of production, their economic relations, change.... however much the relations of production may lag behind the development of the productive forces, they must, sooner or later, come into correspondence with - the level of development of productive forces - the change of productive forces.9

Within this framework, socialism is presented as a period in which production relations are brought into "correspondence" with the productive apparatus developed by capitalism. Moreover, since production relations, and the rest of the "superstructure", are seen as an expression of the level of productive forces, the determinant factor in the progress of socialism toward communism is the development of these productive forces. Indeed, on numerous occasions, e.g., on the occasion of introducing the New Constitution in 1936, Stalin proclaimed that the class struggle had come to an end in the U.S.S.R.[10]

Notwithstanding the criticisms they have made of Stalin, the official Communist parties of Western Europe have not carried out a thorough going theoretical break with Stalin's conception of the transition to communism. What is perhaps more ironic is that political tendencies which are stridently "anti-Stalinist" in some ways, such as the one represented by Ernest Mandel,

have also failed to undertake a real critique of Stalin's conception of the relation between the productive apparatus and the building of socialism. In this regard, let us note some of the main principles of Mandel's thought.

In his major theoretical work, Late Capitalism, Mandel writes of the "growing contradiction between objectively socialised labour and private appropriation", which is determined by "the third technological revolution".[11] For Mandel, the "objective socialisation of production" is propelled - but not essentially effected in its structure - by capitalist production relations. In fact, it is the development of the productive forces by capitalism that Mandel sees as preparing the way for socialism. Socialism is seen as a period in which production relations are brought into correspondence with the "objectively" socialised and centralised character of the productive forces. As Mandel sees it, the productive apparatus itself is socially nuetral. It is enough for society to subject the productive forces to popular control for them "to serve society to the same extent that they seem to enslave it today."[12] In this context, Mandel states:

> Experience has made it quite clear that the fundamental tendency of modern technology ... is to move towards a centralisation and socialisation of labour ... (this makes possible a radical reduction in the working week and the gradual disappearance of alienating mechanical labour once capitalism is overthrown).13

Mandel argues that the "socialisation" the production process

undergoes within capitalism is "irreversible" for technological reasons.[14] Indeed, it is the full realisation of the tendencies inherent in "modern technology" which he posits as the basis of "man's liberation from enslavement to class exploitation, commodity production and the social division of labour."[15] Mandel does not recognise that the capitalist social division of labour and the capitalist technical division of labour are inseparable, the latter being the form given to, and mask of, the former.

As far as I know, Mandel has failed to consider seriously a re-structuring of the productive apparatus as a crucial aspect of the building of socialism. In this he follows Kautsky, Lenin and Stalin. He breaks with Lenin, but follows Kautsky and Stalin, in that he "forgets" that the class struggle remains the primary contradiction throughout the whole historical epoch of socialism. I shall argue in this chapter that the determinant contradiction of socialism must be understood as the (class) struggle to transform the socio-technical division of labour inherent from capitalism. Mandel, on the other hand, maintains that the "chief contradiction of the transition period" is the "contradiction between the socialised mode of production and bourgeois norms of distribution."[16] This contradiction, which "brings factors of alienation into production relations", is determined by the "inadequate level of the productive forces." It follows that, "in the last analysis"[17], the determinant factor in the

building of socialism is the "level of the productive forces."

Mandel writes that: "Belief in the omnipotence of technology is the specific form of bourgeois ideology in late capitalism."[18] I hope to indicate that belief in the ideological, social, and political neutrality of the productive apparatus developed by capitalism is one form bourgeois ideology takes within Marxism.

More specifically, I shall elaborate several basic theses of historical materialism - the full implications of which are still widely unrecognised. The first of these is that relations of production, e.g., private property relations, are organically linked to the structure of the production process.[19] Within a mode of production there is a relation of reciprocal limitation between technical and social production relations. In particular, within the capitalist mode of production, since in it the process of production is simultaneously a process of exploitation, the development of the technical aspects of production is shaped and patterned by the structure of class relations within the production process.

Secondly, I shall argue that in the transition from one mode of production to another it is not the social production relations which "come into correspondence with the level of development of productive forces". On the contrary, within a period of historical transition it is the establishment of new production relations, by means of class struggle, which determines the pat-

tern taken by the subsequent development of the productive forces. As Balibar states, in a period of transition from one mode of production to another, the relation between the technological development of the productive forces and the structure of social production relations is not one of reciprocal limitation. Instead, it is one of the dominance of the latter over the former.[20]

I shall argue, thirdly, that a period of historical transition, such as socialism, constitutes a contradictory combination of several modes of production. It follows from this that conditions for the class struggle will exist throughout the whole epoch of transition - even after the threat of the old exploiting class has been eliminated. In elaborating these basic theses I have relied on a number of major contemporary Marxist theorists; namely, Colletti, Althusser, Balibar, and Poulantzas.

Social Relations of Production

The concept of "social relations of production" is basic to all historical materialism. It is of central importance in an analysis of a transition from one mode of production to another. Yet, even among Marxists, this concept is often misunderstood. I have criticized Kautsky and Lenin for their inadequate recognition that an essential task of the dictatorship fo the proletariat is the creation of new "social relations of production". I will now elaborate some of the basic implications of this concept.

In his analysis of the capitalist mode of production Marx attached the most importance to the process of production. The "spheres" of distribution and exchange are seen as "determined" by this level of human activity. In general, a process of production is characterized by two basic sets of relations. Firstly, a production process consists of men's relations to things, e.g., to nature and the instruments of production. Secondly, a production process consists of men's relations to each other. The unity of these two sets of relations composes the "social relations of production." Marx explains in Wage, Labour and Capital:

> In production, men not only act upon nature, but also upon one another. They produce only to the extent that they collaborate in a determinate way and reciprocally exchange their own activities. In order to produce, they enter into definite connections and relations with one another and only within these social connections and relations does their action on nature, does production, take place.21

In light of the fact that the production process is composed of the unity of these two sets of relations, it is not possible to consider its structure as the result of "purely technical" determinants. Class conflict is not something that only takes place "above" or outside the social production relations. For antagonistic production relations are not the result of previously existing classes; but, rather, social classes are the result of the structure of production relations. Production relations determine the connection of different groups of agents of production to the means of labour, and, consequently, divide the

agents of production into groups with a definite place in the production process.[22] Thus, as Althusser says, "the class struggle is the historical form of the contradiction (internal to a mode of production) which divides classes into classes."[23] Capitalist production then, is a process of class division, class struggle, and exploitation.

In a class society production relations encompass men's relations to the means of production and, through them, their class relations. As Poulantzas stated, these relations have two basic aspects, that of economic ownership and that of possession.[24] Economic ownership generally coincides with, but is not identical to, legal ownership. Economic ownership denotes the power to determine the use of the means of production and to dispose of its products. Possession refers to the ability to put the means of production into operation.

In the feudal mode of production the peasants were not totally dispossessed of the means of production. Consequently, feudal lords exercised their privilege, their right to surplus-labour, through the "extra-economic" extraction of labour or products.[25] On the other hand, in the capitalist mode of production the direct producers are completely dispossessed of the means of labour. The worker possesses nothing but his labour-power. Economic ownership is realised by the capitalist through the incorporation of labour into commodities.

Thus, within capitalism the extraction of surplus-labour takes place directly and entirely within the production process. At this point, we may note the following passage from Capital:

> The specific economic form, in which unpaid surplus-labour is pumped out of the direct producers, determines the relationship of rulers and ruled, as it grows directly out of production itself and in turn, reacts upon it as a determining element. Upon, this, however is founded the entire formation of the economic community which grows up out of the production relations themselves, thereby, simultaneously its own specific political form. (emphasis added)26

For Marx, the modes of distribution and circulation are not something "added to" a base of production relations; rather, as Marx showed in his analysis of reproduction, circulation and distribution are determined by the structure of the production process. This reflects the fact that the purchase and sale of labour-power rest on a distribution of the elements of production "which preceded and presupposed the distribution of the social products, namely ... the separation of labour-power ... from the means of production as the property of non-labourers."[27]

Similarly, political and ideological relations are not merely "based on" production relations; but, rather, production relations contain and presuppose elements of the "superstructure". "The M-C relationship", as Colletti states, "is not only simultaneously a relation between social classes; it already

implies a whole series of political and superstructural conditions."[28] For instance, the relationship between capital and labour-power presupposes a legal-political and ideological superstructure which makes the worker "free" to enter into a wage contract. That certain superstructural elements are called for by certain production relations is the basis for the Marxist thesis concerning the specificity of the state.[29]

If the foregoing discussion has necessarily been somewhat abstract, the conclusions I wish to stress are these. First, the fact the labour-process never exists by itself, but always in its constitutive connection with an ensemble of social production relations, means that technical production relations are <u>inseparable</u> from social production relations.[30] It is misleading to assert as Kautsky did, that "every society is modelled by the technical apparatus at its command."[31] For, as Marx said, production relations not only grow "directly out of production itself", they in turn react upon the production process "as a <u>determining</u> element". Within the unity of the labour process with social relations of production, it is the latter which plays the dominant role. Thus while the capitalist mode of production effects a tremendous development of the production process, this development is not independent of the socio-historical conditions under which it takes place. On the contrary, capitalism develops its own mode of labour which corresponds to the imperatives of capitalist production relations, i.e., relations of qualified and contested capitalist domination.

The principal political conclusion to be drawn from this concept of social production relations is that the primary factor in the transition from one mode of production to another is not the development of technological processes; but, rather, it is the creation of a new structure of production relations. At this point, let us recall that the is no such thing as a "socialist mode of production". For, as Lenin stated:

> ... between capitalism and communism there lies a definite transition period which must combine the features and properties of both these forms of social economy. This transition period has to be a period of struggle between dying capitalism and nascent communism - or, in other words, between capitalism which has been defeated but not destroyed and communism which has been born but is still very feeble.32

Understanding socialism as a contradictory combination of two modes of production is of decisive political importance. Under the dictatorship of the proletariat the proletariat has seized political power. However, even after the proletariat has seized state power, even after the decisive means of production have been nationalised, socialism remains a contradictory combination of two modes of production. It follows from this that certain conditions remain, e.g. the capitalist division between intellectual and manual labour, for the generation of a new exploiting class, and that "only the class struggle on the part of the proletariat can prevent it".33

I cannot explore here the various modalities which this struggle must take. Suffice to say that it must be a struggle

against the basic elements of capitalist production relations, e.g., the division between mental and manual labour, and the division between town and country. It is important to note, however, that this struggle is not dependent upon the continual presence of the old bourgeoisie. For, as Althusser asserts, the class struggle is not the result of the prior existence of social classes; but, rather, it is determined by antagonistic production relations.[34] The production relations inherited from capitalism can only be replaced by communist ones by means of a long, complex class struggle. In this context, the development of the means of production is of secondary importance; their social character being determined by the struggle to create new, or reinforce the old, social production relations.

I have been concerned to elaborate some of the basic implications of the concept of "social production relations" because it is of pivotal importance in any analysis of the transition from one mode of production to another. In what follows, I hope to reinforce this position by examining Marx's analysis of the transition from feudalism to capitalism. In particular, I hope to indicate that the development of the capitalist production process, machine production, presupposed and, was a function of, the establishment of capitalist production relations.

The Transition from Feudalism

The transition from feudalism to capitalism was a process which

lasted centuries and which was characterized by many false starts, many reversals, and many bloody struggles. Marx divides this period of transition into three basic movements: the process of primitive accumulation, the development of manufacture, and the emergence of modern machinery. In his analysis of primitive accumulation, which was the first step in the development of capitalist production relations, Marx stresses that the use of force was of decisive importance:

> ... all employ the power of the state, the concentrated and organised forces of society, to hasten, hot-house fashion, the process of transformation of the feudal mode of production into the capitalist mode, and to shorten the transition. Force is the midwife of every society pregnant with a new one. It is itself an economic power.35

During the process of primitive accumulation, force was used to divorce the direct producers from the means of production. That is to say, it was used to eliminate the aspect possession which had characterized the peasants' relation to the means of labour under feudalism. With the ex-peasants "hurled as free and 'unattached' proletarians on to the labour market", the first requirement for the establishment of capitalist production relations was fulfilled - the emergence of a social group possessing nothing but its labour-power.

In itself, the expropriation of the agricultural population did not create a work force suitable for capitalist production. In his description of the "bloody legislation", Marx explains that agricultural people were first driven from their homes,

turned into vagabonds, "and then whipped, branded, tortured by laws grotesquely terrible, into the discipline necessary for the wage system."[36] Which is to say, capitalist production relations did not evolve spontaneously as the expression of the development of productive forces. Indeed, the assertion of these relations required the use of force and, eventually, of state power.

Manufacture

The process of primitive accumulation did not immediately result in a fully developed system of capitalist production. Between feudalism and capitalism there was a transitional period characterized by a contradictory combination of capitalist and pre-capitalist modes of production.

Manufacture did not revolutionize the labour-process inherited from feudal craft production; rather, it developed the element of specialization contained in craft production. Marx states:

> At first, capital subordinates labour on the basis of the technical conditions given by historical conditions. It does not change immediately the mode of production. The production of surplus-value ..., proved, therefore, to be independent of any change in the mode of production.[37]

Although the development of manufacture was not marked by any qualitative technological breakthrough, it did eliminate certain important characteristics of craft production. Most importantly, with the emergence of manufacture the direct producers were

separated from the means of production and from the results of production. That is to say, manufacture marked the emergence of the wage relation between capital and labour. However, because the labour process was merely taken over from preceding mode of production, the subordination of labour to capital was external and "formal".

During the transitional period of manufacture capitalist production relations lacked a solid basis in that the direct producers still exercised a degree of possession vis-a-vis the means of production. Notwithstanding the extension of specialisation, labour remained the directing and unifying force within the production process. It is for this reason that the use of state power played such a prominent role throughout the period of manufacture. Marx notes that "throughout the whole manufacture period there runs the complaint of want of discipline among workmen."[38] This "want of discipline" reflects the fact the domination of labour by capital was not yet reinforced by the structure of the labour process.

Machinery

The contradiction inherent in capitalist manufacture, between capitalist property relations and a production process still based on craft principles, was displaced by the development of machinery. As long as production was organised on craft principles, workers retained real control over the production

process - even though the capitalist owned the means of production. This control was reflected in the problem of "embezzlement", i.e., the direct appropriation by workers of the products of their labour. It was also reflected in the fact that if only one worker was missing from the process of manufacture, the production unit would be paralysed "in exactly the same way as an artisan would be paralysed in ... his labour process if for some reason he could not perform any one of the operations required for the manufacture of his product."[39]

Marx writes that in all capitalist production it is the instruments of labour which employ the workman, rather than vice versa. "But, it is only in the factory system that this inversion for the first time acquires technical and palpable reality."[40] In this context it is important to remember that, in contrast to previous modes of production, capitalist production relations are characterized by the fact that both economic ownership and possession fall to non-workers. This means every "technological development is conditioned to reinforce the dominance of capital. For, as Marx says, the capitalist production process, is itself a process of exploitation:

> ... the control of the capitalist is in substance two-fold by the reason of the two-fold nature of the process of production itself, - which, on the one hand, is a social process for producing use values, on the other, a process for creating surplus-value - in form that control is despotic.41

In light of the "two-fold nature" of the capitalist production

process, the work of supervision and management must also have a "double nature". The work of management and supervision under capitalism fulfills not only a technical function required by social production. It also functions to reproduce, within the production process itself, the class relations between capital and labour.[42] Moreover, with the development of machinery, this work of management and supervision - in both its aspects - is taken over by the means of production themselves. The reduction of the worker to "an automaton", the domination of living labour by dead labour, is not merely an "accident" of technological development. Rather, as Marx states in the Grundrisse, the development of machinery represents the "historical transformation of the means of labour into means adequate for capitalism."[43] The transformation of the labour process marked by the development of machinery was "adequate for capitalism" in that actual control of the ongoing labour process is concentrated in the property of capital. In Capital Marx explains:

> By means of its conversion into an automaton, the instrument of labour confronts the labourer, during the labour-process, in the shape of capital, ... that dominates, and pumps dry, living labour-power. ... The separation of the intellectual powers of production from manual labour, and the conversion of those powers into the might of capital over labour ... is ... completed by modern industry... The special skill of each individual insignificant factory operative vanishes as an infinitesimal quantity before the science, the gigantic physical forces,... that are embodied in the factory mechanism and, together with that mechanism, constitute the power of the master.[44]

Science, and its embodiment in technology, never exists in a socially neutral form. Scientific discoveries, used to develop productive forces, can only be materialised within the context of capitalist production relations. The development of machinery "makes science a productive force distinct from labour and presses it into the service of capital."[45] The capitalist organization of production and its utilisation of technology are not determined by the requirements of largescale production per se; but, rather, by its existence under capitalist production relations.[46] Every development of machinery and extension of the division between intellectual and manual labour marks not only the technical alteration of the labour-process, but, also, the extended reproduction of capitalist production relations. For this reason, every development of the labour process under capitalism - whether it be the introduction of self-moving machinery or "Taylorism" - has simultaneously involved the class struggle.

Finally, the production process is not only a place where class relations are formed and reproduced; it is also a place where ideas about these relations are formed. Technological applications of science represent the materialisation of capitalist ideology in so far as they presuppose and reinforce the ideological - political conditions of the capitalist production process, the division between intellectual and manual labour. As Poulantzas states, technological developments take place "under the sign of the dominant ideology".[47] Of course, ideology is

understood here not, in the empiricist sense, as an explicitly articulated ensemble of ideas, but as material practices and "rituals" which exist at every level of society - including that of the labour process.[48]

A Fundamental Feature of Historical Transition

Marx's analysis of the transition to capitalism indicates that the transition from feudalism to capitalism was not simply the result of self-movement of the productive forces. Of course, contradictions inherent in the feudal mode of production - e.g., the tendency toward crises of subsistence - did play a role. However, the abolition of small peasant property and the establishment of capitalist production relations were not achieved without a fierce class struggle and the use of state power. e.g., the "Bloody Legislation". As Marx and Engels said in the Manifesto: "The history of all hitherto existing societies is the history of class struggles"; "the class struggle is the motor of history"; etc.[49] Of course, this is a basic Marxist thesis, one to which both Kautsky and Lenin adhered. However, Marx's analysis of the transition to capitalism indicates a fundamental feature of the transition from one mode of production to another which neither Kautsky nor Lenin recognised. This feature indicates the location of the economist/technicalist strain which, to varying degrees, is found in Kautsky's and Lenin's analyses of socialism.

In Capital Marx observes that:

> The production of relative surplus-value revolutionizes out and out the technical process of labour... It therefore presupposes a specific mode, the capitalist mode of production, a mode along with its methods, means, and conditions, arises and develops spontaneously on the basis provided by the subsumption of labour to capital. In the case of this development, the formal subsumption is replaced by the real subsumption of labour under capital.[50]

The distinction between the "formal" and the "real" subsumption of labour under capital signifies - in Balibar's terms - a "chronological gap" between the establishment of capitalist relations of production and the development of a socio-technical division of labour which corresponds specifically to the capitalist mode of production.[51] The transition to capitalism was characterized by a contradictory combination of various modes of production in that the "formal" subsumption of labour under capital was not yet reinforced by a socio-technical division of labour which would reproduce the positions of labour and capital within the labour-process.

The period of manufacture, being a period of historical transition, constituted a combination of various modes of production. It was capitalist in nature in that the worker was totally dispossessed of the means of labour. However, the dispossession or "subsumption" of labour remained only "formal" in that the production process was still organised on craft principles,

labour was still the "regulating principle of social production."[52] Marx writes that:

> In the early stages of capital, its command over labour has a purely formal and almost accidental character. The worker at this time only works under capital's orders because ... he does not have the material means to work on his (own) behalf.[53]

Of course, the dispossession of the workers was not the least bit "accidental". As we have seen, this prerequisite for the establishment of capitalist production relations was the result of an historic class struggle - that of "primitive accumulation". The establishment of these class relations governed the subsequent development of technological forces.[54] With this development the subsumption of labour to capital becomes "real" in that it is determined by the dispossession of the direct producers, i.e., by capitalist property relation, and by the relation, during the labour-process, of the direct producers to the means of production. This is why Marx wrote that the division between intellectual and manual labour and modern machinery, involving the subordination of living labour to capital, fulfills "the fundamental conditions of the bourgeois (mode) of production and are in no sense a matter of indifference or chance."(emphasis added)[55]

Conclusions

The principal conclusion to be drawn from all this is that the productive forces developed under capitalism emerged within the

context of a reciprocal relation with capitalist production relations; the latter playing the dominant role. Under capitalism, exploitation takes place within the labour process. The "technical" aspect of the production process (the production of use-values) is inseparable from the "social" aspect of production (the production of surplus-value). It follows that the socio-technical division of labour - of which modern machinery is an intrinsic part - is "at the heart of the process of exploitation."[56] Which is to say, it is at the heart of the class struggle.

The organic unity between production relations and the labour process which characterizes the capitalist mode of production has crucial implications for the building of socialism. Most importantly, it implies that the primary factor in the advance of socialism is not the "level of the productive forces"; but, rather, the assertion of new social production relations by means of class struggle. It is only under the dominance of new production relations that the development productive forces can occur in a way consistent with the social and political liberation of the direct producers. As I said, I cannot go into the particular modalities that this struggle might involve. But, certainly, it would be a struggle against the three hallmarks of the capitalist socio-technical division of labour; i.e., the division between intellectual and manual labour, the division between town and country, and the subordination of living to dead labour. The class struggle involved in this process will take an entire historical epoch.

For, as Marx insisted:

> The working class know that they have to pass through different phases of class struggle. They know that the superseding of the economical conditions of the slavery of labour by the conditions of free and assorted labour can only be the progressive work of time..., that they require not only a change in distribution, but a new organization of production... They know that this work ... will be again and again impeded by the resistance of vested interests and class egotisms.[57]

Socialism is a contradictory combination of the modes of production under which the dictatorship of the proletariat must, as Marx stated, "serve as a lever for uprooting the economic foundations upon which rests the existence of classes, and therefore class rule."[58] A crucial aspect of the process by which the conditions for the existence of class struggle (classes existing only in their mutual opposition) are "uprooted" must be the politico-ideological struggle of the proletariat.

It is sometimes remarked that, although Marx made an explicit and extensive analysis of the "laws of motion" of capitalism, no one "has succeeded in explaining what the law of motion of socialism ... is supposed to be."[59] It may be concluded from this paper that there is good reason for this apparent deficiency. The great complexity of socialism stems from the fact that it is a process during which the masses, as Lenin said, "engage in independent creative work as the makers of history."[60] Because the development of socialism is determined by the

conscious, collective struggle of the masses to transform their material conditions and, thereby, themselves, there can be no general theory of the laws of movement of socialism toward communism. Moreover, it is precisely for this reason that a clarity on the tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat is essential to Marxism.

Footnotes

Chapter III

1) Karl Kautsky, quoted by, Lucio Colletti, From Lenin to Rousseau, (London: N.L.B., 1972), p.20.

2) Ibid., p.55.

3) Karl Kautsky, The Class Struggle, (New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1971), p.150.

4) V.I. Lenin, The State and Revolution, (Peking: Foreign Languages Press, 1973), p.114.

5) Charles Bettelheim, Class Struggles in the U.S.S.R. 1917-23, (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1974), p.473.

6) V.I. Lenin, "Once Again on the Trade Unions", On Trade Unions, (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1970), p.439.

7) Ibid., p.439.

8) Bettelheim, pp.471-475.

9) J. Stalin, "Historical and Dialectical Materialism", Leninism, (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1947), p.586.

10) Louis Althusser, Essays in Self-Criticism, (London: N.L.B., 1976), p.13.

11) Ernest Mandel, Late Capitalism, (London: N.L.B., 1975), p.585.

12) Ernest Mandel and George Novack, The Marxist Theory of Alienation, (New York: Pathfinder Press Inc., 1970), p.38.

13) Ernest Mandel, Workers' Control and Workers' Councils, (London: I.M.G. Pamphlet, 1972).

14) Mandel, Late Capitalism, p.568.

15) Ibid., p.267.

16) Mandel and Novack, p.38.

17) Ibid., pp.30-40.

18) Mandel, Late Capitalism, p.501.

19) Karl Marx, "On the History of His Opinions", Marx-Engels Reader, Ed. R.C. Tucker, (New York: W.W. Norton, 1973), pp.4-5.

Footnotes - Chapter III (cont'd.)

20) Etienne Balibar and Louis Althusser, Reading Capital, (London: N.L.B. 1970), p.281.

21) Karl Marx, "Wage Labour and Capital", Marx-Engels Reader, Ed. R.C. Tucker, (New York: W.W. Norton, 1973), p.177.

22) Balibar and Althusser, p.176.

23) Althusser, p.50.

24) Nicos Poulantzas, Classes in Contemporary Capitalism, (London: Versco, 1975), p.18.

25) Ibid., p.19.

26) Karl Marx, Capital, (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1962), Volume III, p.791.

27) Karl Marx, Capital, (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1965), Volume II, p.385.

28) Lucio Colletti, p.18.

29) Balibar and Althusser, p.178.

30) Poulantzas, pp.20-21.

31) Karl Kautsky, Ethics and the Materialist Conception of History, (Chicago: Charles Kerr, 1907), pp.89ff.

32) V.I. Lenin, "Economics and Politics in the Era of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat", Collected Works, (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1954), Volume 30, p.107.

33) Althusser, p.22.

34) Ibid., p.50

35) Karl Marx, Capital, (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1965), Volume I, p.688.

36) Ibid., p.688.

37) Ibid., pp.680-690.

38) Ibid., pp.686-694.

39) Balibar and Althusser, p.304.

40) Karl Marx, Capital, (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1965), Volume I, p.399.

Footnotes - Chapter III (cont'd.)

41) Ibid., pp.331-332.

42) Poulantzas, pp.227-228.

43) Karl Marx, Grundrisse, Ed. David McLellan, (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1971), p.133.

44) Karl Marx, Capital, (Moscow: Progress Publisher, 1965), Volume I, p.399.

45) Ibid., pp.361ff.

46) Poulantzas, pp.235-236.

47) Ibid., p.239.

48) On this conception of ideology see Louis Althusser, Lenin and Philosophy, (London: N.L.B., 1972), pp.133-153.

49) Karl Marx and F. Engels, "The Communist Manifesto", The Marx-Engels Reader, Ed. R.C. Tucker, (New York: W.W. Norton), p.335.

50) Karl Marx, Capital, (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1965), Volume I, p.510.

51) Balibar and Althusser, pp.302-304.

52) Ibid., p.238.

53) Karl Marx, Capital, (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1965), Volume I, p.330.

54) Balibar and Althusser, p.304.

55) Karl Marx, Grundrisse, p.149.

56) Althusser, Essays in Self-Criticism, p.23.

57) Karl Marx, "First Draft of 'The Civil War in France'", The First International and After, Ed. David Fernbach, (London: Penguin, 1974), p.253.

58) Karl Marx, "The Civil War in France", The Marx-Engels Reader, Ed. R.C. Tucker, (New York: W.W. Norton, 1973), p.557.

59) Paul Sweezy and Charles Bettelheim, On the Transition to Socialism, (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1971), p.125.

60) V.I. Lenin, "Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government", Collected Works, (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1965), Volume 27, p.230.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albert, Michael. What Is To Be Undone. Boston: Porter Sargeant Publishers, 1974.

Althusser, Louis. Essays in Self-Criticism. London: N.L.B., 1977.

----------. Lenin and Philosophy. London: N.L.B., 1974.

----------, et al. Reading Capital. London: N.L.B., 1970.

Arato, Andrew. "The Second International: A Reexamination". Telos, No.12. (Spring, 1976). pp.18-36.

Balibar, Etienne. The Rectification of the Communist Manifesto. Manchester: Partisan, 1972.

----------. The Dictatorship of the Proletariat. London: N.L.B., 1977.

Bettelheim, Charles and Sweezy, Paul. On the Transition to Socialism. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1971.

Bettelheim, Charles. Class Struggle in the U.S.S.R., 1917-1923. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1976.

Braverman, Harry. Labor and Monopoly Capital. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1974.

Brenner, Robert. "Agarian Class Structure and Economic Development in Pre-Industrial Europe." Past and Present, No.70. (Feb., 1976). pp.20-41.

Burcuory, Michael. "Toward a Marxist Theory of the Labour Process". Politics and Society, Volume 8, No.4. (1978). pp.247-313.

Carlo, Antonio. "Lenin on the Party". Telos, No.17. (Fall, 1973). pp.2-41.

Carrillo, Santiago. Eurocommunism and the State. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1977.

Cluadin-Urondo, Carmen. Lenin and the Cultural Revolution. Sussex: The Harvester Press, 1977.

Cole, G.D.H. A History of Socialist Thought. Volume III, Part I. London: MacMillan, 1956.

Colletti, Lucio. From Rousseau to Lenin. London: N.L.B., 1975.

----------. "The Marxism of the Second International". Telos, No.8. (Summer, 1978). pp.84-91.

Bibliography (cont'd.)

----------. "The Question of Stalin". Revolution and Class Struggle. Ed. Robin Blackburn. Sussex: Harvester Press, 1978. pp.164-191.

Deutscher, Issac. The Prophet Unarmed. New York: Vintage, 1959.

Emmanuel, Arghiri. "The State and Transition." New Left Review, No.113-114. (Jan., 1979). pp.111-133.

Engels, Friedrich. "On the Division of Labour". The Marx-Engels Reader. Ed. R.C. Tucker. New York: W.W. Norton, 1972.

Gorz, Andre. The Division of Labour. Sussex: Harvester Press, 1976.

Harding, Neil. Lenin's Political Thought. London: MacMillan, 1977.

Hilton, Rodney. The Transition from Feudalism to Capitalism. London: Verso, 1978.

Hobsbaum, Eric. "Lenin and the 'Aristocracy of Labour'". Monthly Review, Volume 21, No.11. (April, 1970). pp.47-57.

Kautsky, Karl. "Ultra-Imperialism". New Left Review, No.59. (Jan.-Feb., 1970). pp.41-48.

----------. Ethics and the Materialist Conception of History. Chicago: Charles Kerr, 1907.

----------. The Road to Power. Chicago: Progressive Worker Publishing Co., 1909.

----------. The Social Revolution. Chicago: Charles Kerr, 1902.

----------. The Dictatorship of the Proletariat. Manchester: The National Labour Press, 1918.

----------. The Class Struggle. New York: W.W. Norton, 1971.

----------. Colonial Policy: A Marxist Analysis. Belfast: Athol, 1978.

Krasso, Nicolaus. Trotsky. St. Louis, Mo.: New Critics Press, 1972.

Lenin, V.I. "Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government". Collected Works, Volume 27. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1965.

----------. "Economics and Politics in the Era of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat". Collected Works, Volume 25. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1965.

----------. "On Autonomization". Collected Works, Volume 36. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1955.

Bibliography (cont'd.)

----------. "One of the Fundamental Questions of the Revolution." Collected Works, Volume 25. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1965.

----------. "The Constituent Assembly Elections and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat". Collected Works, Volume 30. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1965.

----------. "'Left-Wing' Childishness and the Petty Bourgeois Mentality". Collected Works, Volume 27. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1965.

----------. "The Role of the Trade Unions Under the N.E.P." Collected Works, Volume 33. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1965.

----------. 'Left-Wing' Communism, An Infantile Disorder. Peking: Foreign Language Press, 1975.

----------. The State and Revolution. Peking: Foreign Language Press, 1973.

----------. What Is To Be Done? Peking: Foreign Language Press, 1973.

----------. Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1975.

----------. "The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky". The Essentials of Lenin, Volume II. Westport, Conn.: Hypercon Press, 1973.

----------. "Imperialism and the Split in Socialism". Collected Works, Volume 23. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1965.

Liebman, Marcel. Leninism Under Lenin. London: Jonathen Cape, 1975.

Lukacs, Georg. Lenin. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1971.

Magri, Lucio. "Problems of the Marxist Theory of the Party". New Left Review, No.60. (March-April, 1970). pp.97-128.

Mandel, Ernest. Late Capitalism. London: N.L.B., 1975.

----------. Workers' Control and Workers' Councils. London: I.M.G. Pamphlet, 1972.

----------, et al. The Marxist Theory of Alienation. New York: Pathfinder Press, 1970.

Marx, Karl. "Wage Labour and Capital". The Marx-Engels Reader. Ed. R.C. Tucker. New York: W.W. Norton, 1972.

----------, et al. "The Communist Manifesto". The Marx-Engels Reader. Ed. R.C. Tucker, New York: W.W. Norton, 1972.

Bibliography (cont'd.)

----------. "Critique of the Gotha Programme". The Marx-Engels Reader. Ed. R.C. Tucker. New York: W.W. Norton, 1972.

----------. "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte". The Marx-Engels Reader. Ed. R.C. Tucker. New York: W.W. Norton, 1972.

----------. "The German Ideology". The Marx-Engels Reader. Ed. R.C. Tucker. New York: W.W. Norton, 1972.

----------. 'The Civil War in France". The Marx-Engels Reader. Ed. R.C Tucker. New York: W.W. Norton, 1972.

----------. "The First Draft of 'The Civil War in France'". The First International and After. Ed. David Fernbach. London: Penguin, 1974.

----------. "Conspectus on Bakunin's 'Statism and Anarchy'". The First International and After. Ed. David Fernbach. London: Penguin, 1974.

----------. Grundrisse. Ed. David McLellan. New York: Harper Torchbook, 1971.

----------. Capital. 3 Volumes. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1954.

Nicolaus, Martin. "The Unknown Marx". New Left Review, No.48. (May, 1968). pp.41-63.

----------. "Middle Class in Marx". Studies On the Left, Volume 7. (Jan., 1967). pp. 112-122.

----------. "The Labor Aristocracy". Monthly Review, Volume 21. No.11. (April, 1970). pp.91-103.

Poulantzas, Nicos. Classes in Contemporary Capitalism. London: Verso, 1978.

Salvadori, Massimo. Karl Kautsky and the Socialist Revolution. London: N.L.B., 1979.

Santamaria, Ulysess and Manville, Alain. "Lenin and the Problem of Transition". Telos, No.27. (Spring, 1976).

Sawyer, Marian. "The Genesis of State and Revolution". The Socialist Register. Ed. R. Miliband. London: The Merlin Press, 1972. pp.209-221.

Skillen, Anthony. Ruling Illusions: Philosphy and the Social Order. Sussex: Harvester Press, 1977.

Stalin, Joseph. Problems of Leninism. Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing Houses, 1947.

Bibliography (cont'd.)

Traut, Ranier. "Lenin and Taylor". Telos, No.37. (Spring, 1979). pp.82-91.